THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH

VOLUME XIX APRIL, 1933 NUMBER 2

GEORGE WHITEFIELD: DRAMATIC EVANGELIST*

C. HAROLD KING
Colgate University

REPORTS of the great evangelist, George Whitefield, bring to us extraordinary tales. History as well as legend has suggested that he was a veritable phenomenon of oratory. Lecky summarized the verdict of history when he said that Whitefield "as a popular preacher indeed . . . . appears never to have been equalled in England." [1] He was an outstanding figure in a movement whose influence upon the social organization, as Halévy says, "would be difficult to overestimate." [2]

If we are interested in the whys and wherefores of Whitefield's achievement we study, of course, his methods as revealed in speeches and in accounts of his manner. But to get satisfying answers there we must have in mind attendant circumstances, so to speak. These circumstances constitute more than polite academic background; they condition, as we all know, the success of the man's methods and often, especially in the case of Whitefield, determine his methods and even his objectives.

Therefore, even in this short article, before considering the oratory of Whitefield as such, it is necessary to give some attention at

*Delivered at the Eastern Public Speaking Conference, 1932, at Columbia University.

[1] W. E. H. Lecky, *A History of England in the Eighteenth Century* (1883), II, 651.

[2] Élie Halévy, *A History of the English People* (1924), I, 372.

least to the immediate character of the audience and the peculiar setting of a typical Whitefield triumph.

Contemporary periodicals estimate the size of Whitefield's crowds at from twelve to thirty thousand.[3] Twelve thousand what? People, of course. But what kind of people? According to the sources Whitefield drew all classes to his magnet: the noble and the peasant, the rich and the poor, the well and the infirm, the merchant, the craftsman, the apprentice, the servant, the negro. But that catholic picture must be qualified somewhat. In spite of Whitefield's being gladdened now and then by the knowledge that "a fine gentleman was touched," in spite of the fact that Lady Huntingdon built a chapel where the aristocracy could listen behind curtains unobserved, in spite of the fact that Whitefield's oratory was praised by Walpole, Chesterfield, Hume, Franklin, and Garrick, nevertheless we also know that Walpole, Chesterfield, Hume, Franklin, and Garrick remained to praise but not to be converted. We are forced to conclude that the intelligentsia and the aristocracy enjoyed a good show but changed not the error of their ways.

The most responsive elements of Whitefield's audience came from the lower middle and lower classes. He himself came to recognize this. On his first pulpit-mission he was disappointed to find himself among poor and illiterate people. He missed his Oxford friends and "mourned for the want of them like a dove." A little later he says, without comment, that the greatest response came from people "at the dock." Pretty soon we find him proclaiming, "God hath chosen the weak things of the world, to confound the things which are mighty."[4] He learned both to glorify the humble and to address himself to them.

His effects were startling. At Cambuslang "You might have seen thousands bathed in tears; some at the same time wringing their hands, others almost swooning, and others crying out and mourning over a pierced savior."[5] At his first sermon he drove fifteen people mad.[6] When he first went to Haworth, England, twelve took com-

[3] See *The Gentleman's Magazine*, XVIII (1748), 329; XIX (1749), 416-417; *South Carolina Gazette*, Oct. 22, 1740.

[4] John Bunyan, *Works* (London, 1767-68), Preface.

[5] John Gillies, *Memoirs of Rev. George Whitefield . . . . Sermons and Other Writings* (Middleton, 1857), 87.

[6] *Ibid.*, 20.

munion; on his second visit there were twelve hundred.[7] In one period of two weeks he collected £500.[8] Money had at that time probably ten times more purchasing power than now.[9] Five hundred pounds then would be equivalent to £5,000 now. Five thousand pounds in ordinary circumstances would equal about $25,000. And that in two weeks.

These large-scale effects bring to our attention another matter. Whitefield was primarily a field preacher. Field preaching is definitely associated with early Methodism. It has not been sufficiently emphasized that Whitefield was responsible for its adoption as an early Methodist institution. He first conceived the idea. One day he was preaching in Bermondsey Church. A thousand people stood in the churchyard who could not get into the church. Hundreds had to go away. As Whitefield was preaching he looked out the window, saw his auditors outside, and suddenly had the impulse to go out and preach to them from a tombstone. Later he mentioned the idea to his friends; they were dubious. Against the advice of his friends, against the opposition of Wesley, in spite of the scorn of the regular clergy, Whitefield stood on a little mound near Bristol and preached to the Kingswood colliers. He was rewarded by seeing tears make white channels down the coal-blackened cheeks.[10] Thus was conceived the great institution of field preaching. Had Methodism not gone into the fields with Whitefield, had Whitefield not been so extraordinarily successful as a field preacher, Methodism would have remained just another sect, or perhaps a little movement within the Established Church. By thus reaching people who could not otherwise have been reached, by bringing under the spell great numbers, by draining off the surcharged and baffled emotion of the lower classes, Methodism was a prime factor, according to Lecky, in saving England from a French Revolution.[11] Something of the situation

[7] Lecky, *op. cit.*, 679.

[8] Gillies, *op. cit.*, 71.

[9] The "salary" officially authorized for a preacher of the Methodist connexion was £12 a year for himself, £12 for the support of his wife, £4 for each of his children. Halévy, I, 361. According to Carl Becker a lower-class family could do very well on £40 a year in the 1740's.

[10] Gillies, *op. cit.*, 39.

[11] Lecky, *op. cit.* II, 691-92. There are other aspects of this matter which one cannot cover in a short paper. The potential revolutionary spirit, not lacking

made possible by field preaching may be inferred from Whitefield's description of a typical scene: "The open firmament above me, the prospect of adjacent fields, ... the sight of thousands, some in coaches, some on horseback, and some in the trees, and at times all affected and drenched in tears together, to which was added the solemnity of approaching evening, was almost too much for and quite overcame me." [12]

Before we can understand what Whitefield said or how he said it, therefore, we must visualize the outdoor preacher whose "sounding board was Heaven" (Whitefield's phrase); we must visualize a crowd of from twelve thousand to thirty thousand; we must realize that the most responsive elements of this crowd came from the humble walks of life; we must realize the limitations of such a crowd and at the same time the great potentialities; we must imagine this mob susceptible to the crude grandeur of a large-scale outdoor situation.

What was the message which Whitefield offered in this kind of situation? He had three cardinal doctrines: (1) Original Sin, (2) Justification by Faith, (3) Election. These were Calvinist doctrines. Whitefield, himself, thought he was a Calvinist.

Whitefield was never weary of reminding his hearers of their natural depravity: "Remember, I beseech you to remember, that you are fallen creatures; that you are by Nature lost and estranged from God." [13] Not until his hearers got that into their heads were they eligible for salvation. Thus it was with Saul: "Saul never prayed in his life: and why? Because, before those three days [during which he was blind], he never felt himself a condemned creature." [14]

When the listeners realized the hopelessness of their situation, Whitefield offered the only remedy which could cure them of all their ills, i.e., Justification by Faith. One could justify himself before God

the incitement of bad conditions, lacked the crystalizing influence of leaders. "But", as Halévy points out, "the elite of the working class, the hardworking and capable bourgeois, had been imbued by the Evangelical movement with a spirit from which the established order had nothing to fear." Methodism's responsibility for the Evangelical Movement is, of course, clear. Halévy, *History of the English People*, I, 371.

[12] J. P. Gledstone, *George Whitefield . . . Field Preacher* (London, 1900), 77.

[13] George Whitefield, *Works* (London, 1771), V, 64.

[14] Gillies, *op. cit.* 356-57.

neither by his human virtue nor by his good works. So the only alternative was to confess one's inadequacy and "borrow the righteousness of Christ." Thus the sinner would be justified by faith. As soon as one completely renounced his past life, with its virtues as well as vices and made an unconditional surrender to God, the phenomenon of conversion followed. And this conversion was the experience everyone had to undergo in order to become "regenerate."

Whitefield proclaimed another doctrine: Election, according to a strict interpretation of which God had predetermined that some of his creatures would be saved and some would be damned. Whitefield engaged in a number of controversies over this matter of predestination. His opponents wanted to know why it was worth while for a man to enter into the severe discipline of a good life if his fate were predetermined anyway, irrespective of whether the man was good or bad and irrespective of his free will to choose. It is not my purpose to enter into the merits of predestination. I am concerned with what Whitefield actually preached, and especially with what his audience understood him to preach. Allow me to call attention to one statement which is typical of what Whitefield actually said: "When we are all convinced of our need and helplessness, and of Jesus being a Redeemer that is mighty and willing to save, a poor soul then throws himself upon this Jesus, receives this Jesus, ventures upon this Jesus, believes the word and by venturing on this promise, receives from Jesus the thing promised."[15] The thing promised was, of course, salvation.

This statement is capable of two interpretations. It may bear out the claims of predestination if the subtleties of theology be brought to bear. The more obvious interpretation is that anyone is eligible for salvation who fulfills the conditions. An audience tends to grasp the more obvious rather than the less obvious interpretation. Whitefield's audience, made up mostly of lower-class elements, would be particularly prone to grasp the more obvious interpretation. It seems more probable, therefore, that while Whitefield thought he was preaching determinism, his audience thought he was preaching a voluntary choice.

At any rate the pattern through which a sinner must go on his way to salvation was as follows: first, he must realize his utter worth-

[15] *Ibid.* 522.

lessness so far as his own virtues or good works were concerned; second, he must renounce all that was earthly and surrender unconditionally to God; third, by surrender he found salvation.

Whitefield's audience was particularly susceptible to this pattern. The maladjusted and often the vicious were willing to better their condition if the remedy was within their reach. Whitefield was drawn inevitably to play upon the innate dissatisfaction with their condition and his remedy was within the reach of all. The eagerness with which a drowning man clutches at a straw must have been approximated by the eagerness with which the poverty-stricken, the social outcasts, the maladjusted of the eighteenth century grasped at the panacea within their reach. Not only were their sins forgiven. If hounded by debt, riches would be waiting; if clothed in rags, fine raiment would be theirs; if blighted by man's contempt, they could become God's elect, destined for royal favor.

How did Whitefield secure acceptance of this doctrine? What kind of sermons did he preach? According to Cornelius Winter who heard Whitefield as often as any man, the most successful sermons were those on such subjects as "Saul's Conversion," "The Conversion of Zacchaeus," "The Resurrection of Lazarus," "Abraham Offering up his Son Isaac," "The Seed of the Woman and the Seed of the Serpent" (the temptation of Eve).[16]

We notice immediately that these titles suggest Bible stories and it was upon Bible stories that Whitefield based his most effective sermons. Each story has a simple but well defined plot, e.g., God decides to test Abraham's faith. He tells Abraham to go into the land of Moriah and there sacrifice his son as a burnt offering. Abraham obediently sets off on the journey. Isaac assists in preparation for his own sacrifice. Abraham binds Isaac, lays him upon the altar and raises the knife to strike. Just as the knife is about to descend, the angel of the Lord bids Abraham stay his hand. To remove any doubt as to the regularity of such intervention a ram appears in the thicket and by virtue of entangling his horns in the underbrush submits himself as a substitute for Isaac.

The story is within the comprehension of the humblest. To make doubly sure Whitefield translates the Scriptural account into yet simpler terms. Now what is simplicity? Perhaps it is after all rela-

[16] See Letter to William Jay, quoted in Gillies, *op. cit.*, 281.

tive. Anyone may say, "If it be not simple to me what care I how simple it be?" Whitefield was well aware of that kind of simplicity which was necessary for his purpose: "I shall endeavor to cloath my ideas in such plain language that the meanest negroe or servant . . . . may understand me. . . ." [17] Simplicity for Whitefield meant putting his ideas within the experience of the "meanest negroe or servant."

Whitefield availed himself of various devices to tie up with his hearer's experience. His colloquialisms put the humble mind at ease, e.g., "Who would have thought of that, probably Jacob did not"; [18] or made certain of a supposedly obvious fact as in "A ladder, you know, is something by which we climb from one place to another." [19]

He took pains to clear up any ambiguity of biblical phraseology, e.g., "It is easier for a camel (or a cable rope) to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God." [20] He knew that threading a needle with a cable rope would come more within the hearers' comprehension than threading a needle with a camel. He did not bother with the tortuous explanation that a needle does not mean a needle but means a gate.

Whitefield continually paraphrases. In the good old days of the Garden of Eden, Eve held conversation with a certain serpent. Whitefield renders it thus: "[The serpent] said to the woman, ye shall not surely die. Surely God will not be so cruel as to damn you for eating an apple." [21]

Whitefield was not merely simple; he was vivid. The nearer an audience approaches the primitive, the more it is inclined to "think" in images. The "meanest negroe or servant" would demand imagery as the price of his attention. He had, of course, a great source of imagery in the Bible. Whitefield accentuates a few details of these images so that a simple yet vivid picture results. For instance when Jacob has his adventure with the ladder, Whitefield emphasized that Jacob looks up while God looks down.[22] When Zacchaeus, that mixture of curiosity and modesty, climbs the tree, Whitefield draws attention to the leaves which concealed Zacchaeus from all but divine observation.[23] In his pictorial art Whitefield could approach the sub-

[17] *Works, op. cit.*, V, 174.
[18] Gillies, *op. cit.*, 537.
[19] *Ibid.*, 532.
[20] *Ibid.*, 403.
[21] *Ibid.*, 315.
[22] *Ibid.*, 534-35.
[23] *Ibid.*, 405

lime. If he spoke of Christ in Gethsamene, Christ was portrayed so that the audience could easily see him in imagination.[24] Whitefield's capacity for the pictorial reminds us of the Arabian proverb: "He is the best orator who can turn men's ears into eyes."

Whitefield's Bible stories were not merely simple and concrete, they were dramatic. There is essential conflict in the stories themselves: the temptation of Eve is a tragedy; virtue wins out in "Saul's Conversion" but only after stirring struggle.

Whitefield adds to the essential drama of his stories by his accentuation of character. In many cases he suggests the character by drawing attention to some significant physical attitude. The Pharisee is represented thus: "Our Lord first takes notice of his posture; the Pharisee stood. . . . Perhaps he pointed at the poor man (the publican) that others might treat him with contempt." [25] Whitefield, however, is capable of a comparatively full-length portrait. Abraham's character is brought out by his "holy familiarity" with God, his unhesitating compliance with God's command, his anguish of soul as he walks beside his son to the sacrifice, the nature of the last farewell.[26] The conversation of the characters is very convincing. Whitefield makes the conversation between Eve and the serpent seem very natural and altogether tragic.[27]

Whitefield, actor that he was, sometimes entered into conversation with celestial beings. One day he was preaching from the balcony of the court house in Philadelphia. Suddenly he cried out, "Father Abraham, who have you in Heaven? Any Episcopalians?" "No!" "Any Baptists?" "No!" "Have you any Methodists there?" "No!" "Have you any independents or seceders?" "We don't know those names here. All that are Christians—believers in Christ—men who have been overcome by the blood of the lamb. . . ." "O is that the case? Then God help me, God help us all, to forget party names and to become Christians in deed and in truth." [28]

Of course Whitefield had an utilitarian motive in creating his dramas. The heroes who conquered and the villains who departed in gloom did so to further Whitefield's message. The "meanest negroe or servant" unconsciously approved Abraham for his faith and con-

[24] Letter of Cornelius Winter to William Jay.
[25] Gillies, *op. cit.*, 381-382.
[26] *Ibid.*, 341-345.
[27] *Ibid.*, 314-316.
[28] *Ibid.*, 340.

demned Eve for her lack of it. They thus partly committed themselves on the great issue Whitefield was leading up to. If the hearer did not realize what would happen to him under analagous circumstances Whitefield pointed it out to him: "The parable of the publican and the Pharisee, is as it were a glass, wherein we may see the dispositions of all mankind: for all mankind may be divided into two general classes. Either they trust wholly in themselves . . . . and then are Pharisees; or they are self-condemned sinners and . . . . they come under the character of the publican. . . . And we may add also, that the different reception these men met with, points out to us in lively colors, the different treatment" each meets "at the terrible day of judgment." [29]

Whitefield, not content with pointing out the alternatives, urges for immediate decision (and right decision, of course). He reminds his hearers, "What if a fit of apoplexy should seize you? And your souls be hurled away before the awful judge of the quick and the dead?" [30] In fact he knows of a young woman who was in good health one hour and then "had an inflammation of the bowels—and is now a breathless corpse." [31]

Having stalked his prey this long while he finally becomes very direct in his plea. He not only tells them all to come but appeals to specific types: "Come dear souls in all your rags . . . . come, thou doubting creature . . . . come poor distressed woman, you, who think God will never forgive you. . . ." [32]

That Whitefield impressed his message upon crowds of 12,000 or more, especially in view of his particular clientele, required delivery in the grand style. To paraphrase Wendell Phillips's remark about Daniel O'Connell: "A dull Whitefield would have been no Whitefield at all."

We should remember that Whitefield had a powerful incentive. He was asking his audience to travel the road he had traveled. He, himself, had been reduced to utter hopelessness because of his sins; he, himself, had surrendered unconditionally; he, himself, had found salvation. Therefore that was the road all men should travel. Thus his natural gifts were energized by the consciousness of a vital message.

[29] *Ibid.*, 386.
[30] *Ibid.*, 388.
[31] *Ibid.*, 505-506.
[32] *Works, op. cit.*, V, 249.

He was not merely a speaker; he was an actor, an actor in the most tremendous of dramas. We know that he had a powerful voice. Franklin testified to the perfection of his articulation, the beauty and capacity for expression as well as the power of his voice.[33] David Garrick said, "I would give a hundred guineas if I could say 'O' like Mr. Whitefield" and declared that were Whitefield on the stage he could make an audience tremble or weep with his varied utterance of the word "Mesopotamia." [34]

Whitefield had the dramatic sense. On one occasion he attended a trial and observed very closely the judge as he put on his black cap and pronounced sentence. Then later at the close of a sermon, Whitefield did the same. He put on a black cap, assumed the forbidding aspect of a judge, told the sinners of the inconveniences of the place they were going to, and finished by proclaiming, "Depart from me, ye cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." [35]

Something of the effect of this sort of drama may be gathered from the following instances. One time Whitefield was preaching to sailors in New York. He described them setting out on a voyage. At first the sky was clear and the sea smooth. But suddenly a storm comes up. He described the gathering of the storm and then "The air is dark! The tempest rages! Our masts are gone! The ship is on her beam ends! What next?" The excited sailors shouted, "The long boat, take to the long boat!" [36] On one occasion Lord Chesterfield was in Whitefield's audience. We all know with what patrician cynicism Lord Chesterfield would have listened to a Methodist enthusiast. Whitefield described an old blind man feebly tottering over a desolate moor, trying in vain to feel his way with a staff. He approaches nearer and nearer to a dizzy precipice. He gets to the very edge, his staff falls over. Lord Chesterfield burst out, "Good God! He is gone!" [37]

Whitefield was no less dramatic in turning circumstance to his account. It was supposedly a handicap to be turned out of the regular

[33] Benjamin Franklin, *Autobiography* (edited by Percy Boynton, 1926), 257-58.

[34] Edward Summerfield Ninde, *George Whitefield, Prophet-Preacher* (1924), 162.

[35] Gillies, *op. cit.*, 282, 264.

[36] Lecky, *op. cit.*, 622-623.

[37] *Ibid.*, 622.

churches. Whitefield instituted field preaching, without which Methodism would not have become such a power as it did. In a period of two weeks he preached from Kennington Common, the Moorfields, a tomb in a churchyard, a bowling green, a yard, a town hall, and a market cross.[38] If a public hanging was available, Whitefield would appear on the stage at the well timed moment and preach that the wages of sin is death.[39]

Resourceful as he was, nevertheless Whitefield came in for a great deal of persecution. He was attacked in Pope's *Dunciad* and in innumerable pamphlets. But these attacks only served as good publicity. He was sometimes roughly treated by crowds. But he remembered the early Christians and gloried in abuse.[40]
In Ireland "the mob pelted him so unmercifully with stones that he barely escaped with his life."[41] But he thought of Stephen and so came off "in bloody triumph."[42] He did not hesitate to identify himself with the apostles nor even with Christ.[43] Ever the dramatist he played the martyr. The man was unbeatable. Master of circumstances, hypnotist of thousands, impregnable in martyrdom, he could not know defeat.

AN APPROACH TO PERSUASION

H. B. GISLASON
University of Minnesota

MY aim in this article will be to suggest an approach to persuasive speaking somewhat different from that ordinarily given, in the hope that it may clear up some difficulties with reference to speech purposes, or so-called General Ends in speaking. Also, perhaps, to define more clearly the place of motivation in persuasive

[38] *The Gentleman's Magazine*, IX, (1739), 215.

[39] *Ibid.*, 245-246.

[40] *Journal of a Voyage from London to Savannah in Georgia*, (London, 1830), 234.

[41] *The Gentleman's Magazine*, XXVII, (1757), 334.

[42] Gillies, *op. cit.*, 169 and footnote.

[43] See *God's Dealings with the Rev. Mr. Whitefield, From his Infancy, to the Time of his Entering into Holy Orders. Written by Himself* . . . . (Edinburgh, 1741), 32.

speech. Lest anyone might think that in so doing I am carrying coals to Newcastle, I quote from a recent textbook: "While the ancients recognized only one end, modern attempts to deal with the question have resulted in a multiplicity of ends with unteachable and unworkable distinctions."

I shall assume that readers of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH are familiar with the literature of the subject, from Aristotle down to, say, the book just quoted from; namely, Sandford and Yeager's *Principles of Effective Speaking*. Also, that they will remember Arthur Edward Phillips's five General Ends: *Clearness, Belief, Impressiveness, Action, and Entertainment*, and the variations played on these by subsequent writers.

If you are familiar in a general way with subsequent classifications, you will observe that there is general agreement among all recent writers in regard to two of these speech ends, namely, those of *Information* and *Entertainment*. A speaker may aim to inform or instruct his audience. He may also aim to entertain them, or as Quintilian would put it, please them. There is general agreement in regard to these two Ends. It is only when we get into the field of *Persuasive Speaking*, or speaking that aims to influence human behavior, that we find some divergence of opinion as to the General Ends. Phillips gives three ends here: *belief, impressiveness, action*. Other writers use somewhat different terminology: e.g. to *induce belief*, to *convince*, to *stimulate*, to *actuate*, to *influence conduct*, to *persuade*, etc. Some recent writers make no divisions within the persuasive field.

Without undertaking to analyze these ends, for the purpose of finding points of agreement, and perhaps some points of difference, let us look at the problem from a somewhat different angle.

I believe it will be found on examination that in persuasive speaking, as a rule, *the speaker is dealing with beliefs*, beliefs that vary greatly in their efficacy or power to influence human behavior. Some of our beliefs are absolute or dynamic, and operate with full force to influence conduct. Others are wavering and doubtful; still others dormant or dead. We believe, for example, that gravitation and other natural laws are at work all the time, and that if we do not order our lives in harmony with those laws, we are liable to get into trouble. If, for example, we throw a stone or shoot an arrow into the air, we

take it for granted that it will come down, and prefer not to take a chance on getting in its path. So there are numberless beliefs in the social sphere that are in a high degree dynamic and operate with reasonably full force and adequacy as determinants of behavior. Such we disregard at our peril. Others operate with more or less inadequacy. If the weather man tells us that tomorrow is going to be "Fair," we shall probably believe it—85 per cent if we happen to know that there is about 15 per cent error in such predictions. We may *think* we believe the time-honored principle "Blessed are they that are persecuted for righteousness-sake," but most of us would be willing that someone else should get the benefit of the experience.

These examples will perhaps suffice to show that in human society there is a *hierachy of beliefs* which operate in varying degrees to influence human conduct. They range from those that are unqualified and dynamic, which no normal person would ever think of disregarding in ordering his life, and down the scale to those other beliefs that operate hardly at all as determinants of behavior.

What, then, is the problem of persuasion in speaking? Obviously, to take a belief at any level, whatever that may be, and make the belief *dynamic*, that is, lift it to the level of *action*, so that it may operate to influence behavior to the utmost. How do we do that? By charging it with a deeper and richer meaning for the listeners, by linking it up with their life-interests and making it *vital* to them. We accomplish this largely through *motivation;* that is, motivating the audience in regard to the belief and showing that it is to their *advantage* to act in harmony with it. Motivation is essentially a process of setting up a system of adequate rewards in the minds of the listeners. Modern psychology has made it plain that we are creatures of desire, motivated by a never-ending quest for the satisfaction of human wants, material, aesthetic, intellectual, spiritual. Show an audience that their most cherished desires and interests are involved in acting in accordance with a certain belief, or course of conduct advocated by the speaker, and they will be readily persuaded to order their behavior accordingly. Desire largely determines judgment.

For speech-making purposes, it will be found convenient, I believe, to classify beliefs on the basis of our attitude toward them. Broadly speaking, we either accept a belief, or we do not. We meet with many propositions, it is true, embodying beliefs that we are

doubtful about or indifferent to, largely because we do not understand their implications. In such cases, it cannot be said that we accept them, and they would therefore fall into the latter class. Broadly, then, we may divide beliefs into two classes, those that we accept and do not significantly dispute; and those that we do not accept. Within each class, we may recognize a gradation of beliefs in reference to the extent to which they function in behavior; or in case of *unaccepted* beliefs, in regard to our hostility to them. We may accept one belief and act on it consistently; we may accept another and merely give it lip-service. Much depends on the nature of the beliefs, how closely they touch our lives. In the case of disputed or unaccepted beliefs, we may be indifferent or in doubt due to lack of understanding of the facts involved, or we may be positively hostile. The more indifferent or hostile we are, the greater of course is the persuasive problem.

It is my opinion that each of these two classes of beliefs gives rise to a somewhat distinct type of speech, both of which we may consider briefly.

We recognize a large class of speech subjects which deal with propositions that are not in any significant sense disputed. In fact, I venture to affirm that the majority of class speeches are of this type. Familiar examples of speech aims of this order are: We should keep our appointments promptly, take an interest in social problems, work to prevent automobile accidents, take preventive measures against tuberculosis, etc. These speech aims embody beliefs that are generally accepted. Such beliefs operate with varying degrees to influence our lives, depending on their nature and their position in the scale of beliefs. Those high in the scale would be fairly dynamic and would serve materially to influence behavior. Others, lower in the scale, would have less affective meaning for us, and to some we would merely render lip-service, perhaps think of only on Sundays.

There is an endless array of subjects to be found that come within this class. Most sermons are of this type and most political speeches. Very few political speeches—or others for that matter—deliberately aim to change people's views. A Republican, as a rule, speaks to an audience of Republicans; a Democrat, to an audience of Democrats; a Socialist, to a group of Socialists. There may be a fringe of dissenters, but the ordinary political speech is not addressed to these. This may not be the highest type of political speech, but it is the most

common one. I should be inclined to classify all eulogies under that type of speech, although there might be some difference of opinion here. The aim of a eulogy is usually to hold up as examples to the living the virtues and achievements of the dead. The Chautauqua lecture, if it aims to do more than merely amuse or entertain, would be included here. So, too, the larger number of occasional addresses, so far as they are more than a few informal and relatively aimless remarks, would come under this head.

Here is a distinctive type of speech, more common than any other, aiming to *vitalize* and make *dynamic* accepted beliefs, which, in varying degrees, function inadequately in behavior. We accomplish this end by setting up a system of adequate rewards for whatever form of behavior we seek to inculcate; or in other words, by an effective appeal to the impelling motives. While this is a persuasive type of speech, it does not include the whole class of persuasive speeches, as it deals only with *accepted* beliefs or undisputed propositions. Incidentally, this type of speech is without a name. What should we call it? An *impressive speech?* An *inspirational speech?* Or what?

Let us now consider the second class of beliefs: namely, those that are *not accepted by the audience*, and embodied in *propositions that are disputed*. We recognize a large class of these subjects or speech purposes, giving rise to another distinct type of speech, usually known as the Argumentative speech. The speech problem here is somewhat different from the one presented in the type previously studied. There is, in truth, an added burden on the speaker arising from the fact that he is dealing with beliefs that are not accepted, beliefs which rest on propositions that must be proved *true*, before such beliefs can be *vitalized* or made *dynamic* for the audience through adequate motivation.

In this type of speech we distinguish two kinds of propositions, which go by several names. If we are disposed to use philosophical language, we may call them *judgments of fact*, and *judgments of value*. If we prefer less technical language, we may use the terms, propositions of fact and propositions of policy. It does not make a great deal of difference what terms we use provided we are agreed on the meaning. To say that chain stores provide substantial economies to their customers is to express a judgment of fact. So it is also a judgment of fact to say that the St. Lawrence Waterway is feasible

from an engineering point of view, or that drinking among young people has not been diminished by the Eighteenth Amendment, assuming that to be true, or that automobile accidents killed over thirty thousand people in 1932. The problem here is to prove these propositions *true* or *false*. This is the function of *evidence* and *logical* argument,—and perhaps *suggestion* as well. The process of establishing the truth or falsity of these propositions has nothing to do with their social significance, or their interpretation in terms of the *human values* that may depend on them. In other words, it has nothing to do with *motivation*.

As examples of judgment of value, or propositions of policy, we may list almost any question for debate or argument. The United States should join with Canada in building the St. Lawrence Waterway, the Eighteenth Amendment should be repealed, a state income tax should supplement general property taxes, etc., are familiar examples. Almost invariably questions are argued or debated in this form. One might hold a lively debate on the question whether the Eighteenth Amendment has decreased the consumption of liquor, which is purely a proposition of fact: but more often resolutions for debate involve questions of policy. It will be observed that all these questions lend themselves to *motivation*. That is, they raise the question, what is their *social significance?* What are they worth to society, and more particularly to the audience addressed, in human values, in satisfying human wants? Only so far as the speaker can interpret for his hearers the significance or value of these propositions and bring such values vividly home to them, can he make such beliefs function in behavior.

It will be observed that, strictly speaking, propositions of policy (judgments of value) cannot be *proved true* or *false*. We may be able to prove true or false the propositions of fact on which they rest, but the propositions themselves, more accurately speaking, we *evaluate*, show what they are worth in terms of human satisfactions. We cannot prove true or false that we should cancel the war debts, but by a careful examination of the facts involved, we can interpret the meaning or value of the proposition, and on the basis of such evaluation, win acceptance, and perhaps get active support, for such a belief,—make it function in behavior. It would be in the interest of accurate laguage, I believe, if we limit the word *proof* to proposi-

tions of fact. Propositions of policy, we *support* or *evaluate*. Every teacher of speech must have felt how unsatisfactory is the word *proof* to describe the support of propositions in an Impressive speech, or propositions of policy in an Argumentative speech. As a matter of fact, there is usually nothing to prove in an Impressive speech. We do not *prove* that we ought to keep our appointments promptly, or be loyal to our convictions, or do a thousand other things that one might in a speech exhort us to do. We admit it all beforehand. The problem is one of creating or interpreting *values*, of setting up a system of rewards in the minds of the audience, of making them want to do the things we want them to do. The problem, that is to say, is one of pure motivation.

The fact remains that in this type of speech, propositions of fact generally predominate. It is precisely because there are so many propositions of fact at issue in questions argued or debated that the argumentative speech always deals with disputed ideas or beliefs.

There is no doubt that beliefs not accepted vary greatly both in regard to the difficulty of proving true the propositions of fact on which they rest, as well as in point of difficulty of evaluating them, or motivating an audience in regard to them. The audience's attitude may be, "We might accept your proposition, but what is it good for in satisfying our wants?" In other cases, it may be difficult to prove true the propositions of fact on which a judgment of value rests, and easy to motivate an audience in regard to it if the facts are proved favorable. There are times when an audience is motivated in advance in regard to a policy and asks only to be shown that the facts are favorable. That might be true of an audience assembled to hear a speech on the League of Nations. The audience's attitude might be, "Show us that the League will prevent war and that it is not dominated by two or three European powers, (or whatever the facts in dispute may be) and we will be with you." Still, even here if an audience were asked to make contributions to further the cause, they might need some motivation on the subject. It would probably be necessary to appeal to their feelings and emotions by presenting to them vivid images of what war does to us and what we would escape by making the League function.

On the other hand, a belief that might be easily supported as to the facts and difficult in regard to evaluation or motivation, might be,

"We should discourage the organization of chain stores." It would be easy to show that chain stores effect substantial economies to their customers, tend to wealth concentration, and that their local managers are seldom permanent residents of a community. We would recognize the first of these effects to be good, and the second and third bad. The real problem, however, is to discover, how good is the first, and how bad are the other two? That is a process of evaluation or motivation. In a question like this, it is fair to say that the real problem is one of motivation.

Let us now in the light of this analysis try to interpret the phrases used to describe Speech Ends, quoted at the beginning: and first, those of Phillips—*Impressiveness, Belief, Action.* It should be fairly plain now that all these are only steps in the process of making our beliefs function more fully in behavior. All these steps are involved in every persuasive speech, especially of the argumentative type, for we get action—influence behavior—by being impressive and convincing; interpreting the former to imply an appeal to the feelings—motivation—and the latter to refer to adequate proof of propositions of fact.

Phillips is not altogether clear, as a matter of fact, as to what he means by *Impressiveness.* He says it "implies vividness. The idea is not simply seen but felt. It has emotional association. The preacher is not content that the personality of Christ should be understood,—it must stir the soul." One recent textbook, at least, interprets this to mean that impressiveness is to be regarded as an attribute of the Informative speech. I submit, however, that when we begin to make people *feel deeply* about an idea and to *stir the soul* in connection with it, we are in the field of motivation.

I take it that by *Impressiveness* as a General End in speaking, Phillips has in mind an objective that is to be attained primarily by an appeal to the feelings and emotions, which to my understanding means Motivation; that is, setting up a system of rewards in the minds of the listeners so that they will *want* to do as the speaker wants them to do. This is precisely the aim of the Impressive speech as I have endeavored to expound it. Strangely enough, Phillips does not link this type of speech with the Impelling Motives at all, notwithstanding the fact that the Impressive speech depends for the attainment of its end on the effective appeal to motives and nothing else. Dealing as it does

essentially with accepted beliefs, it is the one type of speech in which *evaluation* of ideas, or motivation, is all important. In the Argumentative speech, Motivation may play a major role, as already shown, and many a speech of that type misses fire for lack of adequate motivation. More often than not, however, the Argumentative speech is likely to be concerned largely with the *proof* of propositions of fact. These in turn will support a judgment of value that may or may not be of such obvious social significance as not to need much motivation in connection with it.

It seems to me that there has been much vague thinking and resulting confusion in regard to the relationship between an appeal to the feelings and emotions and the so-called impelling motives of action. Phillips seems to think that our motives and emotions occupy separate compartments of the mind, whereas they are very nearly identical. Woolbert, in describing *Stimulation* as an End, by which he means, I take it, the same as Phillips does by *Impressiveness*, says, its aim is "to rouse the audience to a firmer grip on convictions they already hold." This is substantially correct, but not very illuminating as to the process of motivation involved in the attainment of that end.

It should be made plain that our feelings and emotions are as inseparably connected with our wants and desires—the satisfaction of which constitutes human values—as wind is inseparably connected with air. In fact, it may be said that just as wind is simply air in motion, so our feelings and emotions are simply our wants and wishes in action. To want something is to experience a feeling or emotion concerning it. If our wants are making progress in the direction of being satisfied, we experience pleasurable emotions. If our wants are not making progress toward finding satisfaction or are in the process of being defeated or frustrated, we experience unpleasant emotions. If we are hungry and cannot get food, out of work and cannot get a job, lonely and cannot find friends, we have painful feelings or unpleasant emotions. If we are looking forward to attending a fine concert, a play, or a football game, we have pleasurable feelings or emotions. Appeal to the feelings and emotions, motivation, want appeal, —all mean about the same thing. All have reference to the process by which a speaker creates a *desire* in his audience to adopt the course of conduct advocated, by showing that it will result in the satisfaction of fundamental human wants.

I am unable to see that a more or less aimless emotional appeal, *impressiveness,* is ever properly the end of a speech. To impress an audience with the personality of Christ or of Abraham Lincoln, or of George Washington has no meaning except in relation to some form of behavior. The process is, as a matter of fact, unthinkable. We may speak of Christ's compassion, or of Lincoln's tolerance, or of Washington's high ideals of public service, but what are these except forms of behavior that we are trying to inculcate in our listeners, if the speech has any meaning? The speech which aims to stimulate the feelings or emotions, does so in connection with some contemplated form of behavior, and has just as definite a message as the speech that seeks to persuade to some *overt* action. The speech aim, "We should be tolerant of other people's opinions" is just as definite as "We should vote the Democratic ticket." True, it does not contemplate so specific a form of action, but it aims to influence behavior in a very definite way, and the processes involved in attaining the two ends are, as a rule, exactly the same. In other words, *action*—influencing behavior—is just as definitely the end in working for impressiveness as it is in advocating some definite, overt behavior.

There is no sound psychological distinction, either as to the ends sought or as to the means of attaining them, between stimulating the feelings—motivating an audience—in regard to some form of behavior, such as keeping appointments promptly, cultivating courtesy, being tolerant of other people's views, on the one hand, and voting for a certain amendment or candidate or contributing to a cause, on the other. In all these cases the aim is to *influence conduct,* and whether it be to get definite, overt, immediate action, or to set up attitudes or predispositions to act in a certain way when the appropriate occasion is presented, the persuasive problem is essentially the same. As William James puts it, "A resolve whose contemplated motor consequences are not to ensue until some far distant future conditions shall have been fulfilled, involves all the psychic elements of a motor fiat except the word 'now'." [1]

Neither is the establishment of *belief,* the ultimate end of a speech or very seldom so. Such phrases as, "to induce belief," "to convince," convey only a very indefinite meaning, unless we limit them to mean

[1] William James, *Selected Papers on Philosophy* (Everyman's Library, n. d.), 69.

proving propositions of fact. Their meaning, however, is not generally so limited. "To induce belief" would seem to refer only to such beliefs as the audience do not accept, for we cannot be said to induce a belief that is already accepted. It can be applied then properly only to an Argumentative speech. Whether we limit its meaning to the process of proving true propositions of fact, or read into it a wider meaning to include emotional stimulation, it still remains only a *means to an end*,—the influencing of behavior in some form. The same may be said of the phrase "to convince."

It is possible, of course, to conceive of a speech situation in which the speaker, without having in mind the influencing of behavior, at least in a practical way, would deal only with propositions of fact; e.g., That Mars is inhabited, or that the solar system is moving in a certain direction in the heavens. Even then, if the fact of Mars being inhabited were established, it would set up a certain attitude and a predisposition to act if the occasion were presented. As already suggested, merely proving true a proposition of fact, may predispose persons to act in a very definite way. An engineer may seek to prove to members of his profession or to a political commission that the St. Lawrence Waterway is feasible from an engineering point of view; but the effect of such a speech would obviously be to influence *action* in regard to the building of the waterway. The point to be made here is that the establishment of a fact is very seldom, if ever, an end in itself, but only a means to an end. We are interested in a judgment of fact only as it affects some judgment of value.

My conclusion is then, that the simplest and clearest approach to persuasion is through the hierachy of our beliefs; that in their powers to influence behavior, our beliefs run the whole gamut, from one hundred per cent efficacy to one that approaches zero; that the persuasive problem is always either to vitalize old beliefs that function inadequately in our lives and make them function more fully, or else to change old views and establish new beliefs and make them bear fruition as fully as may be in human conduct. On the basis of this efficacy to influence behavior, we may divide beliefs roughly into two classes; those that we accept or do not seriously dispute, and those that we do not accept or to which we are hostile. Corresponding to this division, we may recognize two fairly distinct types of speeches, the Impressive and the Argumentative speech. In the former, dealing as it does with

beliefs that are accepted, and with convictions that influence our lives in varying degrees, the problem is one essentially of *motivation;* that is, creating a *desire* on the part of the listeners to do as the speaker wants them to do; to set up a system of rewards in the minds of the hearers so that they will find it to their advantage to adopt the course of action advocated. This involves an appeal to the impelling motives of action, whatever they may be. It is not denied that an appeal to the understanding frequently clears the way for persuasion, and so may be an important element in the speech problem, but the goal is always to influence behavior, either through some definite overt action, or through setting up beliefs or attitudes that will function in behavior when occasion presents.

The second type of speech, the so-called Argumentative speech, differs from the first in that it deals with *disputed* beliefs or propositions, those that the audience do not accept, and to which they may be positively hostile. It will be found that such beliefs always rest on propositions of *fact* that are in issue, and that the problem here is largely to get at the facts. Motivation also may be a very important factor in the Argumentative speech. An analysis of the speech problem will reveal which factor predominates. Both types of speech have *action* as the end, in the sense that they aim to influence behavior.

DEBATE AND THE SCIENTIFIC ATTITUDE

JOHN L. CASTEEL
University of Oregon

WHEN the modern biographer chooses to parade once more the life of some important figure of the past, he justifies his presumption by saying, in a modestly worded preface, that he has unearthed a new letter, found a flaw in the chronology of his predecessors, or discovered a distant and nonagenarian acquaintance of the late renowned, whose powers of reminiscence still sparkle with pristine lustre. On the basis of these new sources he feels impelled to give the world a corrected portrait of the famous one.

Some such piece of apologetics ought to preface any revival of the old question, "What has happened to the debate audience?" I have no such justification to offer, but bring up the question again

because it still seems to be an unanswered one, and because at least one aspect of the problem of debate audiences does not seem to have been brought into earlier discussions. One might say, to return to the earlier comparison with biographers, that this subject still belongs to the class where no "definitive biography," no exhaustive discussion, has been written as yet. I want to mention one of the factors that, in my view, will bear upon any definitive treatment.

The tale of the rise and fall of debate audiences is too well known, perhaps too painfully known, to need extended review. In my college debating days, the hardy perennials on our faculty reminded us at salutary intervals of the good old days when rival colleges chartered special trains and brought team, band, and rooters to invade the sanctity of the old chapel,—all to prove their concern with the subtleties of the income tax, or the moral issue of whether the killing of Sitting Bull should be condemned as cold-blooded murder. A debate in those days, so we were told, was pregnant with momentous uncertainties. Not only were Justice and Truth at the mercy of unscrupulous sophists (represented variously by visiting teams) but the intellectual integrity of the institution, the personal careers of the debaters, and occasionally, in true Siwashian fashion, a handful of love-affairs also hung in the dialectic balance. An encounter of these proportions was a thing to be girded for through months of study; three such combats in one year was considered a threat to the stability of the academic routine.

I do not know that this impression of debate in former days is at all valid for the history of any or all other institutions. But there will be general agreement, no doubt, to the view that interest in debating has changed, either in quantity or quality, or perhaps both. It is almost trite to remark that from every source complaints are heard over the failure of our debates to draw audiences.

Explanations advanced for this change in interest are likewise familiar. The waning of student interest in hearing debates has been assigned to various causes. First, there has been the large extension of debating schedules. The three debates in the schedule of thirty years ago would hardly make a season now. But while the number of debates has multiplied in order to extend debate training to more students, or for other reasons, the number of questions debated has not always increased. The usual practice has been simply to hold more

debates on the same question. The debate coach feels that he cannot direct the training of too many men on too many questions and still maintain standards. At the same time, students have not shown any great interest in attending five consecutive debates on the same question. When an audience of students appear to listen to the first major debate of the season, one is encouraged to believe that some spark of interest in "intellectual things" still flutters on the campus; but when the same students come back the fourth and fifth time to hear the same arguments on the same subject, one begins to wonder about the level of their mental powers.

Again, the style of debating done in the past has been cited as the cause of evaporation of student interest. The visits of the English teams, and the modifications of old debate "systems" and styles of presentation, have shown that there is some truth in this charge. In many instances, however, the new interest shown as a result of these innovations has been ephemeral, and in the opinion of some, what was gained in interest was lost in solidity of argument. In many instances, too, the interest aroused by the visit of a foreign team was not continued to the debates held with nearby institutions.

In some instances, also, the loss of student debate audiences has been assigned both to the stultifying effects of the decision-debate, and to the absence of the conflict element in non-decision debate. The attendance at both types of debates seems to fluctuate in accordance with other factors, so that no causal inference seems justified in either case; and obviously both accusations can't be right.

The interest shown by people outside our colleges is more difficult to measure in any general way. In the old days, the townspeople are said to have turned out for the verbal conflict with the same sense of loyalty to all issues involved as did the students. But the attitude toward institutions located within the environs of a town or city has changed as well.

Of recent years, some directors of debate have made a new effort to enlist the interest of society-off-the-campus in debate. Luncheon clubs, chambers of commerce, granges, even ladies' aid societies have been solicited for speaking engagements, and some new opportunities opened in this manner. It is probably too early to say whether the future of debate lies in training students for such discussions.

Now all of these explanations of the disappearance—or reappear-

ance, perhaps,—of the debate audience have dealt with the subject from the standpoint of a rather immediate interest. There are also some considerations of a more remote, but perhaps more fundamental, nature that affect people's interest in debate. I should like to mention one. This is the change in the audience's attitude toward the reliability of argument as a means of deciding issues, marked chiefly by what appears to be a growing tendency to seek for and accept only the opinion of the expert in arriving at judgment. I do not mean to say the millenial day has come when people defer judgment upon questions until they can have the discriminating testimony of the highly specialized expert; I mean simply that they like to think they are following the judgments of men who, in their eyes, embody the scientific attitude.

The evidences of this tendency seem so obvious that they need not be recited at length. Every advertisement for anything from gargles to galluses flaunts its proof of scientific verification. Politicians seem to have appreciated the advantages of bringing forth their programs under the cloak of reports from scientific commissions. The scientific pose has become the new persuasive guise. If one wishes to look for further evidence, he may read from the report of the President's Committee on Recent Social Trends, of the rapid increase in the sales of popular scientific literature, or he may observe how readily the idea of Technocracy is fitting into the shallow grooves of the popular mind. It does not matter so much that this attitude represents only a pseudo-scientific faith and a naive reliance on any quack who poses as an expert. What matters, so far as debating is concerned, is the fact that people think they are depending upon the scientist and the expert.

How will this attitude affect the status of collegiate debating? For one thing, it would seem to place a larger importance upon the use of expert testimony in proof. This matter, however, is not our present concern. From the standpoint of the audience, are we likely to find a decline in the prestige of the college debater, reflecting itself in declining audience interest? I have no overwhelming proof that such a development will take place, and, of course, no great interest that it should take place. But some observation of the attitudes of both students and public seems to give an indication of its likelihood.

Let us remind ourselves, for one thing, of the general attitude

toward any important question that is instilled into college students, with various degrees of success. What is that attitude? Is it not one which says that the solution of any question is to be reached through scientific research, and that until one has made such research, either he should defer judgment, or he should follow the opinion of someone whom he feels to have made such research? The whole emphasis of the physical and biological sciences, and now, of the social sciences, is upon the generation of this attitude. As a consequence, one is likely to find a hierarchy of "experts" among college people: the major in economics, for example, scorns the economic opinions of the sophomore who has taken one elementary course; the candidate for the master's degree laughs off the misconceptions of the major; the doctorate fellow turns out the conclusions of the lowly M.A., while professors and deans accept the theories of the doctorate noncommittally. I do not mean to say that these attitudes are as vitriolic in any case as I have stated them here. But it seems often that the opinions of any one of these individuals get only light consideration from the man next above him. Said a visiting debater on our campus last year, while cross-questioning a member of the local team, "Did you ever take a course in economics?" The witness admitted that he had, once. "Well," said the prosecutor, "you'd better take a few more courses before you try to debate a question like this." One could hardly reply that debaters are chosen, not on the basis of the number of courses in economics that they have had, but on the basis of their interest in debating, and their need of it.

Perhaps this insistence upon expert knowledge will never really figure much among the larger part of our student bodies; perhaps we will just have to let them go on in their waywardness, which is certainly unscientific enough in some respects. But among the students whom we might expect to interest as audiences the attitude is likely to become of increasing pertinence.

How might such an attitude affect the interest of the public? Again, there are only obvious indications to be noticed. As one looks over the names and qualifications of speakers who appear at luncheon clubs, public forums, speech occasions of almost any sort, one observes the prominence given to the speaker's qualification as an expert in the field he is to discuss. Some years ago, the minister was called upon to speak for all sorts of occasions and upon all sorts of

subjects. But today, when the minister speaks outside his pulpit, he does so only on the more or less formal occasions, such as Memorial Day and Commencement, or he speaks as something of an expert in his domain of religious or moral problems. Problems of economics, politics, health, education, are assigned to men who may be regarded, rightly or wrongly, as experts on those particular subjects.

Now, when the college debate teams are to speak before the local Kiwanis club on the question of the general sales tax, what expert qualifications can they present? Only those of local undergraduates, sitting at the feet of the local professor of economics, with some additional research directed by the debate coach, who is so busy with briefing and rubbing off angular elbows that he can't possibly become an expert on the subject. Why, say the Kiwanians, should we not hear the economics professor himself? "Your debates are all right," said one man, "but so often they are comparatively shallow. Your debaters simply don't understand their problem deeply." The same attitude was expressed by another man in a different way. A letter had been circulated by our coach of women's debate announcing that the women were preparing to discuss the question of socialized medicine, and would be glad to appear before any organization that would care to listen to a discussion. A prominent local physician hastened to get in touch with the coach, and offer his services in preparing the teams. "I am in favor of the affirmative in some respects," he said, "but I think great care should be taken not to disseminate erroneous ideas on the subject." Apparently he felt that the subject was one involving considerations beyond the grasp or researches of college students. It is probably unnecessary to say that the question of socialized medicine is hardly more complex than that of the tariff, disarmament, or similar resolutions, and certainly no more beyond the powers of the college students than the taxation question in use by many high schools this year can be over the heads of preparatory school debaters.

This is not the place to go into other reasons why college students may not command prestige as speakers before public audiences. Students today hardly sit on the fearsome pedestal where perched our high-collared, mustached spokesman of thirty years ago, when a college student might still have honor in his own country. Students today are "just students," and debaters, too, may be "just students" in

the eyes of a public who like to believe they are following the experts, yea, even the Technocrats.

Will the scientific attitude put an end to debate as a method presenting and solving public problems? Perhaps we should all like to know. If it should, if questions of social science should eventually become laboratory matters as questions of physical science did years ago, what outlet will be found for our speech activities? Shall we try to preserve our tradition in the monastical practices of the debate tournament, with the audience to be swayed composed of a chairman, a timekeeper, and Job for the judge? Or will we turn our energies to public presentations characterized chiefly by entertainment? The alternatives may not be as extreme as that; perhaps none of these speculations will develop as I have tried to describe them here. But in any case, in our discussions of the debate audience, it would seem that we cannot neglect the "rising tide of scientific temper," whether it be the mind of the true scientist, or the medicine man in a Technocrat's coat.

A PROPOSED CHANGE IN INTERCOLLEGIATE SPEAKING*

ARLEIGH B. WILLIAMSON
New York University

WHILE public display of virtue cannot be thought of as commendable, neither, it seems to me, can the performing of all one's virtues in private and one's vices in public be regarded as desirable. I fear that this latter course is one too generally followed by teachers of speech. We tend to perform our good deeds in the privacy of the classroom and our evil deeds upon the public-contest platform. It will be evident that I am referring to our oratorical contests and debates, which, to my mind, are not a true representation of our best classroom instruction and do not exemplify our high-water mark in the development of student speakers. That there is a definite cleavage between classroom instruction and our contests, arising out of the fundamental nature and basic purpose of each, I long ago concluded. Yet we are judged by students, college administrators, and

* Delivered at the National Convention, 1932, in Los Angeles.

the public largely on the basis of these contests, and as far as I have been able to determine, these, in their present form, do not rate very high.

This paper is not concerned with speaking activities in general, but solely with debate. At the outset, I want to remove any belief that I am absolutely opposed to debate or that I disclaim any benefits as a result of debate training. I believe firmly that some debate experience—perhaps in the classroom—is useful as a part of any speech training. I am speaking as one who has, until this year, sponsored debate activities throughout his whole career as a public-speaking teacher and whose present conclusions are based on his experience and observations during that period. I speak as one who has for years included, and continues to include, a certain amount of debate training in every argumentation class for which he is responsible. I am fully aware that many good speakers, men prominent in public life today, can be pointed to as former college debaters. I am fully cognizant that many such prominent citizens have also given great credit to debate training on their road to success. The question I would raise is whether we have equipped these very men as well as we might have under a different system. And a more important question is how much have we done for the far larger number of former debaters who still remain obscure. A still more important question is, are we today, through our contests, equipping as well as we might students who show promise of becoming influential public servants.

The purpose of this paper is in no sense an effort to discard any possible virtues of debate. It is rather a plan to keep its virtues and scrap its evils by attempting to put into practice a different system, which will give students all the benefits that debate can provide and add many valuable aspects of speech training in general absent in our present intercollegiate contests.

I, therefore, do not feel that I am so much an enemy of contest debating as I am a friend of public-speaking instruction and one zealous of the reputation in the academic world of our subject and our teachers. I am convinced that our present contests, because they too generally do not represent our highest aims and our best instruction, are not completely satisfactory. Further, I see no reason, if we are willing to depart from tradition and to experiment with the ideas ad-

vanced by many thoughtful men and women of our field, why we teachers of speech cannot evolve a form of intercollegiate speaking activity that will more fully represent those aims and that instruction, an activity that will be better training to fit a student for public life than is formal debate, that will give him as sound a training in argument, that will be essentially more in accord with the social tendencies of our time, and will be generally more socially influential with audiences.

In the past ten or more years much has been said and written by members of our own profession, more than by our critics, about the weaknesses of debate contests; and the fact that there have been commendable attempts on the part of many speech teachers to improve intercollegiate speaking, by making the subject matter more interesting and by endeavoring to get rid of the contest element, should not be passed by without a word of praise. I do not believe, however, that we have gone far enough in reform. Admitting that some intercollegiate debate, in its improved forms, may be desirable, may it not be that, by allowing it to dominate the field of intercollegiate speaking activities, we are overlooking opportunities? A question I would raise is, can debate itself be sufficiently altered to meet the need for improvement? Do we need reform so much as direct change by building up a more widely used, newer form of intercollegiate speaking?

I need hardly mention the fact that debate and debate training in college have been under continuous fire for years and have been attacked by many eminent men in public life. I mention this to introduce a more gentle attack by a well-known modern psychologist and philosopher, Professor H. A. Overstreet. In a conversation a few months ago, Professor Overstreet explained to me the reason for his adverse attitude. He said something like the following, that debate belongs to a social order which is dying out, if it is not already dead, an era of irreconcilable conflict on social questions; that the present era is characterized by men trying, even when dominated by opposing views, to get together on social problems in an effort to find solutions; that, in a group, the individual thinks his own plan of most importance not simply because it is his own, but rather because it is the most feasible and practicable plan.

Taking a bird's-eye glance at the speaking that is done throughout

this country, where, outside of representative assemblies and law courts, do we find much use of debate? It is questionable if it plays so large a part even in the activities of representative assemblies as in years gone by. Real debate does not appear to play a large part even in political campaigns. For years, in New York City, I have been listening to speeches by prominent men, and the debate would seem to be almost an exception. There have been in recent years a half-score of prominent debates in New York City, for the most part featuring Clarence Darrow. An example is the Darrow-Durant debate on "Is Man a Machine?" But seldom even in these debates do the speakers clash on issues. I have heard some of these debates, and I sincerely doubt if, as far as audiences are concerned, they have been of much social value. I doubt also if many listeners would put themselves out to repeat the experience.

The attitude prevalent in a conference I recently attended seemed to support Professor Overstreet's observations. It was the Conference of University Presidents held in New York City under the auspices of New York University. On the program were some of our best-known college and university presidents and some outstanding leaders in business and professional life. The subjects of discussion all fell under the general heading of *The Obligation of Universities to the Social Order*; and the general divisions were "The University Today, Its Aims and Province," "The University and Economic Changes," "The University and Governmental Changes," "The University and Spiritual Values." It will be seen that these subjects offer the possibility of controversy. The groups of speakers had varying points of view and different proposals, and, to some extent, they clashed on issues. Yet it seemed to me that in the entire conference there was only one speaker who debated. The attitude of all the rest was, even in difference of opinion, one of co-operation, an effort to find a way out, an urge to improve and co-ordinate; and it would be surprising if a definite benefit to higher education and to society in general would not result from this wholesome discussion and the diverse proposals.

The speaker who was most impotent was the debater. He was the president of a denominational college and spoke in the program on spiritual values. Earlier, the poet Alfred Noyes had made a most inspiring address, as had a number of others including the president

of the University of California. The debater contentiously arose and told all the other speakers that they were wrong, that they were not talking about spiritual values at all, but of a different kind of material value, and that the only real spiritual value is the traditional spiritual value, sponsored, it was intimated, by a certain branch of the Christian church. The address was well delivered, the speaker seemed reasonably likable, he was not greatly tactless; but he was absolutely out of accord with the dominating spirit of co-operative effort to solve existing problems. No good could possibly have come from his address. Everyone must have been thrown upon the defensive by the contentiousness of his attitude. I did not trust to my own judgment in my reaction to his speech, but at once made inquiries of others in attendance and found my conclusion supported in every instance. I regret to say that this well-known college president had all the earmarks of the general run of college debaters.

I have asserted that there is a distinct cleavage between the greater part of our contest activities and our classroom speech training. Let us see if that statement can be justified. What is the basic purpose of our public-speaking courses and what training is involved in the accomplishment of that purpose? Many of us will vary in our definitions, but perhaps we can come to something like an agreement on the following:

> The basic purpose of public-speaking training is that of communicating ideas and influencing audiences. This involves:
>
> 1. Training students to gain enough knowledge of any subject to make straight thinking on it possible.
> 2. Training them to think straight.
> 3. Training them to organize, compose, and word material so that it can be effectively presented to others.
> 4. Training them sufficiently in the grace of speaking itself to render the straight thinking embodied in the well-organized composition articulate and effective with audiences.

That intercollegiate debate attempts to carry out the research and straight-thinking aspects of speech training, we shall agree. We might also agree that it teaches organization and composition and delivery. However, we should not all agree that in the average debate—and that means, in my experience, the larger portion of college debating—the organization and delivery are *effective* in presenting ideas to others or in rendering a composition articulate and effective

with audiences. The fault here, if it be a fault, which renders debate too generally socially inarticulate and ineffective, is not due to the coaches or the debaters, but rather to the essential nature of formal debate. The difference between classroom training and contest debating is fundamentally one of purpose. The purpose of the average debate is dissimilar to that advanced above as the basic purpose of the public-speaking course. Generally speaking, intercollegiate debate is essentially a game; its purpose is contest. The speakers are playing a game against their opponents, and are not primarily concerned with influencing their audience, unless, in the case of audience-decision debate, their effort is to get the audience to decide on the winner of the game. Even the "no-decision" debate, founded as it is on the traditional method of debating, becomes an anomaly, a game without a winner.

Looked at from the audience's point of view, the switching back from one side to the other of the question—a matter that frequently involves twelve speeches—renders clarity difficult and real conviction almost impossible. The participants have so many facts to give, so many trends of argument to follow, so much refutation to undertake, that those graces of composition essential to real clarity, to communication, and to conviction in an audience, must, perforce, too often be sacrificed.

What are some of the results of this sacrifice? I shall not dwell upon the highly controversial charge so often brought against debate, that it encourages students to advocate plans and to support arguments in which they do not believe, that debate is a splendid training-ground for future barristers who will take any side for a fee. The fact, however, does remain that this is a constantly recurring attack which cannot be ignored.

A more important result of this sacrifice is that, while it must be admitted that many students come through the debate-experience good speakers, perhaps a far greater number become moulded into dull purveyors of uninteresting facts and dry arguments. And so they generally remain, unless by some process or other they are re-educated in speaking. I am convinced that the experience of many public-speaking teachers will bear out my own, that only too often the most difficult student to teach a form of communicative speaking which is apt to be socially effective is he whose talents have been warped in the school of debate.

This warping in training was brought most forcefully to my attention at the convention, a few years back, of a national intercollegiate forensic fraternity. Represented at that convention were star debaters from schools and colleges all over America. For two days I listened to these debaters and I was convinced that not more than two of them were a credit to any public-speaking department. I am not speaking now of voice, diction, and gestures. I am talking of plain matters of interest, clearness, and convincingness. Never anywhere have I heard such a boresome lot of speakers. While the situation illustrated here is perhaps not fully representative of our intercollegiate instruction, the fact that so many students who have had specialized training in speaking show so little resultant benefit might easily raise among administrators and faculties the question whether public-speaking training is of real worth. College education in general is today being subjected to much criticism, and the effect within the college itself is already one of subjecting everything offered in curricula to very careful scrutiny as to worth. It might be the better part of judgment for us teachers of speech to scrutinize our own training before outsiders do that for us.

My present effort is an attempt at just such a scrutiny. For the sake of conciseness in that attempt, permit me briefly to restate the points of weakness just discussed:

1. Contest debating is in general so uninteresting that only with the greatest difficulty, as a rule, can audiences be mustered.
2. This lack of interest is due to the essential nature of debate, its purpose, its form, and its methods, all of which are based so little on the idea of obtaining responses from audiences that the contests are, in general, largely ineffective in shaping audience opinion.
3. The training for the student, neglecting, as it too generally does, constructive social attitudes and true persuasiveness, is too one-sided, and too often develops in him attitudes and methods which will hinder rather than help him in the speech situations of later life.
4. Many persons question the training on the basis of honesty of opinion.

Out of many years of observation of experiments in speech activities, of listening to discussions at public-speaking conventions, of

reading, and of discussing the whole situation with many of my colleagues at home and abroad, I am going to make a proposal as an effort towards the elimination of these contest weaknesses. I have no guarantee that adoption of the proposal will result in complete remedy. I have no belief that I have hit upon a panacea for all contest ills. And in presenting this plan I make no claim to originality. Most of the suggestions I am making have been spoken and written about innumerable times and tried out in varying ways in many colleges. Many of the suggestions will be recognized as having come from this or that source. My effort, if it has any virtue of originality, is one of synthesizing these different proposals and experiments into a definite plan to be more generally experimented with, then changed and improved as experience points the way. My primary purpose is that of presenting something tangible as a means of beginning a contest reform.

The plan which comes out of this synthesis of the contributions of many is built upon the following foundation:

1. Encourage at least as thorough research on social subjects as does debate.
2. Teach sound principles not merely of argument but of argument as a method of making sound reasoning a vital thing to audiences; of argument as a means not of winning a point, right or wrong, or of tricking an opponent or beating down opposition, but of aiding audiences and speakers alike to form clear judgments on the merits involved in various aspects of a problem. This involves sound methods of organization, composition, rhetoric, persuasion, and delivery.
3. Do not limit the discussion to an affirmative and negative of a proposition, but choose for discussion a vital social problem toward the remedy of which as many plans may be advocated as there are speakers.
4. Encourage the individual student, after adequate research and thought, to follow absolutely his own convictions.
5. Stimulate in the individual speaker the scholarly and social attitude that the matter of importance is not that his plan, but rather the most sound and practicable plan, wins acceptance. The ideal held before the student should be the scholarly attitude which, while holding an opinion, is open to conviction,

an attitude which should leave him free to modify or even abandon his plan if a sounder one is advanced.

6. Require that refutation, where used, shall not be an effort to beat opponents, but rather to point out fundamental weaknesses in fact or argument. A difference between this plan and that of the usual debate refutation is largely one of attitude. In debate the speaker must answer an opposing argument or his opponents will win. The attitude of the present plan should be that, if there is weakness, the audience should know of that weakness.
7. Link the activity to the social-science groups of the college by bringing into the discussion a faculty—or other—authority, in the field of the subject.

The following is a specific plan of procedure which might be built upon the aims just outlined.

1. The activity might be known by such a name as the *Intercollegiate Forum*.
2. A number of colleges in a given area should agree to experiment with the activity and form a league for that purpose, this league to arrange a schedule for the separate forums.
3. Each participating college should further agree to give as much attention to this activity in the way of coaching and budgeting as it has in the past to debate. In the beginning, both the schedule and the monetary appropriation might be divided between the Forum and debate.
4. Something like three forums should be held each year at each participating college, which, in all probability, would mean that not all the colleges would be represented in any given meeting.
5. Three colleges should be represented in each forum and plans for the particular forum be arranged by correspondence of those guiding the activity in the three colleges.
6. Subjects, perhaps often suggested by student interest and research, should be chosen from vital current problems.
7. In the beginning, speakers might be chosen from present college debaters flexible enough to adjust themselves to change, from students recruited in public-speaking classes, and from interested social science majors and minors.

8. Each session should consist of four student speakers representing three (perhaps four) colleges, a faculty—or other—authority in the field of discussion, selected from any college, and a chairman. The authority might also be the chairman.
9. The first speaker should be an expositor, who should give in no more than fifteen minutes, an interesting, informative background of the subject as a basis for the proposals of the other three speakers.
   (a) This expositor might be chosen from any of the three colleges on the basis of qualification.
   (b) The expositor might send a brief of the facts of his exposition to the three other speakers.
   (c) The three other speakers, after examining the brief, might suggest to the expositor additional facts or in their own speeches give such supplementary facts as are essential in making their proposals convincing.
10. There should be three fifteen-minute proposals from each of the three other student speakers, as solutions to the problem;
   (a) Avoidance of duplication of proposals would need to be adjusted through correspondence, perhaps, in a large measure by the students themselves.
   (b) A large enough squad of speakers in each college would be needed to make this breadth of proposal possible.
   (c) According to this plan two speakers would represent one college and one each the other two. Perhaps a better plan might be to have the expositor come from a fourth college.
11. There should be a five to seven minute restatement by each of the three speakers, if each desired this time.
   (a) This provision should be flexible enough to permit one speaker to allot part or all of his time to one or both other speakers.
   (b) The restatement might consist of revealing the weaknesses in fact or argument in the proposal of another speaker. It might be, on the part of the one making the restatement, a modification of the earlier proposal. It might be a defense. It might, sometime, be a complete withdrawal. However, no speaker at any time should be

obliged to compromise, modify his own, or accept another's view, except through conviction.

12. The faculty authority should, in no more than fifteen minutes, sum up and end the discussion in any manner that he chooses, except that he should not be permitted to give a decision on the merits of the speakers as such or name a winner or best speaker. He might, however, reveal weaknesses in the proposals, support any proposal as such, or offer a further proposal of his own.
13. If time permitted, perhaps the audience might be given opportunity to ask questions or make statements.

I have discussed this plan with a number of public-speaking teachers and with men prominent in the social sciences who have shown interest in speech activities. Both groups have thought the plan practicable and desirable. Several possible weaknesses were, however, pointed out, and a number of pertinent questions were raised. The remainder of this paper will, consequently, deal with those questions.

The first is whether or not the proposal implies doing away entirely with debate. My answer is, "Certainly not, until some other system has proved itself to be better." This paper advocates an experiment on a large scale, and, if it is necessary to curtail part of a college's debate activities to make that experiment possible, well and good. If some colleges should feel inclined temporarily to suspend intercollegiate debate in order to give undivided attention to the experiment, so much the better. There should be no real loss as a result of such suspension.

A question quite appropriately raised is whether all questions for discussion would fit into this plan. The most appropriate questions for the forum are general subjects which offer the possibility of a number of clear-cut lines of action; such as, for example, war debts and unemployment. The framing of a proposition ought to be avoided when feasible. The exception would be those problems which offer no other possibility than an affirmative or negative stand. In the working out of the scheme to suit all subjects, problems of adaptation would most certainly arise. However, where the particular subject did not fit into the plan, the plan ought to be modified to fit the subject.

In the case of those problems which do permit of only an affirmative or a negative position, such, for example, as the recognition of Soviet Russia, the question is whether our present form of intercollegiate debate in not the best way to clarify issues and make possible public judgments. There are too many extant species of college debating to make possible a definite answer on that question. If the questioner means the more usual form of debate, participated in by the greater number of high schools and colleges throughout America, the answer is decidedly, "No." If he means some of the newer forms of debate, practiced by a few colleges, forms many of which closely approximate the forum ideal, the answer might, in many instances be, "Yes." Professor Sheffield in a recent article in the QUARTERLY JOURNAL speaks of the usefulness of debate in the case of purely affirmative-negative problems. But I strongly question whether Professor Sheffield has in mind our more usual form of intercollegiate debating. I feel strongly that the forum plan herein proposed,—modified perhaps in some particular—because of its emphasis on adaptation to audience, could, in dealing with such questions, be made to serve a more useful purpose than the usual debate, with emphasis on contest. In the forum, the difference in treatment would be largely of attitude and emphasis.

Another pertinent question is whether, with the contest element removed, student speakers could be as readily enlisted in this form of activity as in debate. While I may be optimistic in my view, experience would seem to indicate that there is always a group of students interested in public questions who would welcome an opportunity to discuss them. The attraction of speaking with a group of representatives of other colleges in the auditorium of another college ought to be sufficient inducement. Besides, a trip and a new experience are always inducements. Our present debate system is none too attractive for the greater number of students with speaking ability. There is a possibility that an activity of the kind suggested, after it became known on the campus, might attract many of the best students in the field of the social sciences.

There is the question, too, whether the project would win the support of college administrators. I do not believe that administrators are generally so enamoured of debate that they would not be

willing to experiment. It seems probable that they would be willing to accept the judgment of the public-speaking teacher.

There may be doubt as to whether it would be any more possible to muster audiences for this kind of speaking than it is for debate. Perhaps not at first; although the mere element of novelty, if properly advertised, and the opportunity of hearing expressions of opinion on important questions from the better students of the colleges and universities might create a surprising interest from the very beginning. The additional feature of having a faculty authority discuss the proposals and the subject should be a decided factor in favor of public interest. If the activity fulfilled its purpose, since the entire project is based upon audience adaptation, there should be a growing interest from year to year.

There is, too, the possibility of the speaking degenerating into mere oratory. Preventing such degeneration would depend upon the wise guidance and emphasis of the public-speaking teachers directing the activity. The fact that no award would be made to a university or to individual students should help prevent the student from falling into such oratorical practices as are often employed merely to win. If the instructor could impress upon his speakers that what is essential is scholarly understanding of the subject, deep conviction arising out of knowledge and sound thinking, coupled with the ability to present the results of this understanding and reasoning clearly, honestly, tolerantly, and persuasively to audiences, there should be little danger of so-called oratorical degeneration.

There is the serious question as to whether the student participants would not, in spite of the plan, merely engage in debate. That could be avoided only by a grasp, on the part of the instructor, of the essential difference between this type of persuasive yet co-operative attitude in speaking and that of the contentious clash so common in debate. The ideal for coach and student speaker should be that of four educated, socially conscious, humanly sympathetic, courteous gentlemen, exploring for an audience the possibilities of varying viewpoints.

The question might be raised as to whether or not this plan is based upon the discussion, or conference, method, and whether or not a final decision ought to be arrived at as a result of the speeches. There is a distinct difference between this plan and the group discus-

sion method. In the first place the scope of fitting problems is perhaps far wider than any that can be handled in the average group discussion. The latter deals with more limited problems upon which a decision can be made, and action taken. Such procedure is, in a large measure, impossible in a broad problem such as war debts, disarmaments, the depression, the Manchurian situation or any other major social problem. Perhaps there might be a rare occasion when general agreement would be the natural outcome. However, to force the speakers against their will to change their stand to make the Forum end in a single decision would seem to be arbitrary, artificial, unsound, and not fully in accord with scholarly principles.

And it might be wondered whether or not, if a final agreement were not reached, the discussion of the speakers would be, as far as the audience is concerned, constructive. The audience, if it became informed upon the facts of a problem and had heard explored for it the possibilities of the major proposals of solution, should be provided with a basis for future judgments and attitudes. They should, as a result, be able to think more clearly upon the issues of that problem. This would seem to be thoroughly constructive. It is doubtful if the forcing of an arbitrary decision or ideal plan would be more constructive, unless the ideal plan were a *natural*, not arbitrary, result of the discussion.

Another question is whether or not the faculty authority ought to unify all of the proposals and draw a point of general agreement. If there should be any general agreement amongst the speakers, it might aid in clarifying issues if that fact were made clear to the audience. It would seem that the best policy might be one of letting the authority say what he thought most fitting, with few limitations except those suggested in the preceding plan.

Some one may question the soundness of my advocating widespread adoption of a plan without first having tried it out myself over a period of years. In many colleges, as Professor Sheffield points out in his aforementioned article, variations of the forum plan have been used. In the college where I am teaching variations of the plan have been tried out in the classroom, and at the present time one of our debate coaches is carrying on a somewhat similar experiment with other educational institutions in New York City. It is difficult, if

not impossible, to give such a project a fair trial without the co-operative interest of a number of other colleges.

And that is the direct purpose of this paper, an effort to enlist a group of adventurous public-speaking teachers, willing to depart from traditional practices, in an extended experiment to evolve something generally better than that which has come to us from the past. Only by a considerable number of us carrying on an experiment together over an extended period can we hope to make a constructive change. The experiments with student forum speaking have, up to the present, been too spasmodic and unorganized to make any real inroads against the weaknesses of our intercollegiate speaking. The present purpose is an effort to organize those who are in complete or partial revolt against the older form, plus all others who see possibilities of progress in the experiment, into a group to try to develop a form of intercollegiate speaking that will, more than the usual present contest, be a credit to us as public-speaking teachers, that will make clearer to administrators and faculties the vital purposes of public-speaking training, that will be of greater benefit to students as training, and that will be of more real value in helping to create a public better informed on important questions.

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF DEBATING

DAYTON D. McKEAN
Princeton University

THE need for an adequate bibliography of the field of speech has long been recognized. It is needed, not only for students, but for teachers as well. It is unnecessary to call attention here to the many bibliographies in other subjects, or to point out again how useful they have been. THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH has, fortunately, undertaken a bibliography of the whole subject. It is in the hope that this one may be helpful in compiling the general bibliography that it is published here.

Some of the problems met with in compiling this bibliography will undoubtedly face the committee when it comes to make up the final one. The most difficult problem here was what to exclude, for debating shades over into public speaking, particularly into the study

of persuasion. But in the belief that subsequent collections would cover the fields, books on persuasion, group discussion, logic, collections of debates, and general textbooks with some treatment of debate have been omitted. Access to some books here listed was impossible, and in some instances, no doubt, books are listed here which more properly belong in other fields. Suggested additions or corrections, which will make the final bibliography more useful, are invited.

Wherever such books as *Debate Manual* or *Debaters' Handbook* appear below they are books about debating, not collections of debate materials. Unless otherwise noted, the place of publication is New York.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

North Carolina State Library, *Debating: A list of books on debating.* Raleigh, N.C., 1915.

Pittsburgh Carnegie Library, *Debate Index.* Pittsburgh, Pa., 1912; rev. ed. 1915, 1917, 1919.

Virginia State Library, *A List of Books on Debating in the Virginia State Library.* Richmond, Va. Bull. of the Virginia State Library, vol. 88, no. 1, Jan., 1915.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS ON DEBATING

Alden, R. M., *Art of Debate.* Holt, 1900.

Arnold, J. H., *The Debater's Guide.* Harrisburg, Pa.: The Handy Book Co. 1923.

Babcock, R. W., and Powell, J. H., Jr., *How to Debate.* Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1923.

Baird, A. C., *Public Discussion and Debate.* Ginn, 1928.

Baker, G. P., *Principles of Argumentation.* Ginn, 1895; rev. ed., 1905.

Baker, G. P., and Huntington, H. B., *Principles of Argumentation.* Ginn, 1905; rev. ed., 1925.

Barrows, L. D., *Rudiments of Public Speaking and Debate.* Methodist Book Concern, 1861.

Baylor University, *Suggestions on Debating.* Waco, Tex.: Debater's Research, 1926.

Bell, Edwin, *Principles of Argument.* Rochester, N. Y.: Lawyers' Co-operative Pub. Co., 1910.

Borden, R. C., and Busse, A. C., *How to Win an Argument.* Harper, 1926.

Brown, C. W., *Complete Debater's Manual.* Chicago: F. J. Drake Co., 1902.

Buck, Gertrude, *Argumentative Writing.* Holt, 1899.

Collins, G. R., and Morris, J. S., *Persuasion and Debate.* Harper, 1927.

Covington, H. F., *Fundamentals of Debate.* Scribners, 1918.

Covington, H. F., *Pamphlet on Debating and Brief Drawing.* Privately printed, 1903.

Covington, H. F., *Suggestions for Debaters.* Princeton, N. J.: Cliosophic Society, 1903.

Davis, H. C., *Debating for High Schools.* Columbia, S.C.: The University, 1920.

Denny, J. V., Duncan, C. S., and McKinney, F. C., *Argumentation and Debate.* American Book Co., 1910.

Densmore, G. E., *Contest Debating.* Ann Arbor, Mich.: George Wahr, 1929.

Drury, N. B., *Debating Material.* Berkeley: Univ. of Calif. Ex. Div. Bull. Ser. 4; Bur. Pub. Dis. no. 1, 1914.

Everett, G. A., and Phipps, G. R., *Principles of Debate.* Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell Country Life Ser. no. 149, 1919.

Fort, L. M., *Argumentation and Debate.* Mitchell, S.D.: Educator Supply Co., 1925.

Fort, L. M., *Oral English and Debate.* Holt, 1929.

Foster, W. H., *Debating for Boys.* Macmillan, 1915.

Foster W. T., *Argumentation and Debating.* Houghton Mifflin, 1908; rev. ed., 1917, 1932.

Foster, W. T., *Exposition and Argument.* Houghton Mifflin, 1911.

Fox, A. N., *Modern Debating.* Chicago: Follette Pub. Co., 1932.

Fritz, C. A., *Method of Argument.* Prentice-Hall, 1931.

Fuerst, Max, *Rede-, Debatten- und Versammlungstechnik. Eine praktische Anleitung zur Ausbildung als Redner, von Max Fürst.* Marburg: Potentia, 1924.

Gardiner, J. H., *Making of Arguments.* Ginn, 1912.

Gislason, H. B., *Effective Debating.* Univ. of Minn. Bull. Gen. Ser. no. 14, 1919.

Gordon, A. L., *Debate Manual.* Young People's League of the United Synagogue of America, 1927.

Graves, H. F. and Spotts, C. B., *The Art of Argument.* Prentice-Hall, 1927.

Hall, C. C., *Value of the Debating Society.* Brooklyn, N.Y.; privately printed, 1890.

Henry, W. H. F., *Practical Debater.* Indianapolis, Ind.: J. E. Merrill, 1884.

Holyoake, G. J., *Public Speaking and Debate.* McElrath and Barker, 1853—first Amer. from second London ed. Second Amer. ed. rev., Carlton and Porter, 1863.

Holyoake, G. J., *Rudiments of Public Speaking and Debate.* McElrath and Barker, 1853—first Amer. from second London ed., rev. by L. D. Barrows, Carlton and Porter, 1861.

Howes, R. F., (Editor) *Debating.* Heath, 1931.

Immel, R. K., and Whipple, R. H., *Debating for High Schools.* Ginn, 1929.

Jones, Leo, *Manual for Debaters.* Seattle: Univ. of Washington Bull. Gen. Ser. no. 75, 1913.

Ketcham, V. A., *Theory and Practice of Argumentation and Debate.* Macmillan, 1914.

Kinnamon, A. J., *Debater's Handbook.* Chicago: T. S. Dennison, 1887.

Kleiser, G., *How to Argue and Win.* Funk and Wagnalls, 1911.

Kline, R. E. P., *Argumentation and Debate.* Chicago: LaSalle Extension University, 1910.

Knowles, J. S., *The Debater's Handbook*. Boston: Lothrop, Lee, and Shepard, *c*. 1887.

Lahman, C. P., *Debate Coaching*. Wilson, 1930.

Laycock, C., and Scales, R. L., *Argumentation and Debate*. Macmillan, 1904.

Laycock, C., and Spofford, A. K., *Manual of Argumentation for High Schools and Academies*. Macmillan, 1913.

Lee, A. S., *Literary Manual: a Handbook for Colleges, Schools, and Debating Societies*. Cincinnati, Ohio: published by the author, 1880.

Lockridge, R. F., *Debating and Public Discussion*. Indianapolis, Ind.: Univ. of Ind. Bull. vol. 11, no. 6, 1913.

Lyon, L. S., *Elements of Debating*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1913; rev. ed., 1932.

Lyman, R. L., *Principles of Effective Debating*. Madison, Wis.: Univ. of Wis. Bull., Gen. Ser. 426, serial no. 608, 1913.

Lyman, R. L., *Debating Societies*. Madison, Wis.: Univ. of Wis. Bull., Gen. Ser. 346, serial no. 517, 1913.

Lyman, R. L., *How to Judge a Debate*. Madison, Wis.: Univ. of Wis. Bull., Gen. Ser. 423, serial no. 605, 1913.

MacEwan, E. J., *Essentials of Argumentation*. Heath, 1898; rev. ed., 1906.

Macpherson, William, *How to Argue Successfully*. London: G. Routledge and Sons, 1913.

McElligott, J. N., (1812-1866) *The American Debater*. Ivison, Phinney, Blakeman, *c*. 1855; rev. ed. *c*. 1867; third ed. *c*. 1870.

Maxcy, C. L., *The Brief: with Selections for Briefing*. Houghton Mifflin, 1916.

Miller, C. G., *Argumentation and Debate*. Scribners, 1931.

O'Neill, J. M., *A Manual of Debate and Oral Discussion for Schools, Societies and Clubs*. Sturgis and Walton, 1915.

O'Neill, J. M., *Debating Societies: Organization and Procedure*. Madison, Wis.: Univ. Ex. Div. Gen. Ser. no. 1115, 1925.

O'Neill, J. M., *Principles of Effective Debating and How to Judge a Debate*. Madison, Wis.: Univ. Ex. Div. Gen. Ser. no. 1114, 1925.

O'Neill, J. M., and Cortright, R. L., *Debate and Oral Discussion*. Century, 1931.

O'Neill, J. M., Laycock C., and Scales, R. L., *Argumentation and Debate*. Macmillan, 1917.

O'Neill, J. M., and McBurney, J. H., *Working Principles of Argument*. Macmillan, 1932.

Pattee, G. K. *Practical Argumentation*. Century, 1909; rev. ed. 1915.

Perry, F. M., *Introductory Course in Argumentation*. American Book Co., 1906.

Phelps, E. M., (Editor) *Debaters' Manual*. Wilson, 1915; sixth ed., 1929.

Pittenger, William, *The Debater's Treasury*. Philadelphia: The Penn Pub. Co., 1911.

Reed, A. G., and Adams, J. Q., *Suggestions for High-School Debaters*. Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State Univ. Bull., vol. 5, N. S. no. 2, pt. 2, 1914.

Reeves, J. W., *Fundamentals of Argumentation and Debate*. Heath, 1917; rev. ed. 1920; third rev. ed., 1928.

Rigg, L., *Platform Oratory and Debate for Schools and Colleges*. Stokes, 1929.

Ringwalt, R. C., *Brief Drawing*. Longmans, 1923.

Robbins, E. C., *High School Debate Book.* Chicago: A. C. McClurg, 1911; 1913; 1923.
Robinson, A. T., *Applications of Logic.* Longmans, 1912.
Rowton, Frederick, *How to Conduct a Debate.* Dick and Fitzgerald, *c.* 1840.
Rowton, Frederick, *The Debater.* Longmans, rev. ed. 1850.
Shaw, W. C., *The Art of Debate.* Allyn and Bacon, 1922.
Shaw, W. C., *The Brief-Maker's Note-Book for Argumentation and Debate.* Ginn, 1916.
Shurter, E. Du B., *How to Debate.* Harper, 1917.
Shurter, E. Du B., *Science and Art of Debate.* Neale Pub. Co., 1908.
Shurter, E. Du B., *Science and Art of Effective Debating.* Noble and Noble, 1925.
Sidgwick, Alfred, *The Application of Logic.* Macmillan, 1910.
Sidgwick, Alfred, *Process of Argument.* London: A. and C. Black, 1893.
Sims, J. G., *Debating as an Educator.* Fort Worth, Tex.: published by the author, 1926.
Smith, E. W., *Handbook of Debate.* Hamilton, N.Y.: The New Century Press, 1912.
Smith, Reed, *Effective Debating.* Columbia, S. C.: The University. Bull. Univ. of South Carolina, no. 60, 1917.
Stone, A. P., and Garrison, S. L., *Essentials of Argument.* Holt, 1916.
Thomas, R. W., *Manual of Debate.* American Book Co., 1910.
University of California, *Debating and Debating Societies.* Berkeley: Univ. of Calif. Press, 1914.
University of Indiana, *Debating and Public Discussion.* Bloomington: Ex. Div. vol. 11, no. 6, 1913.
University of North Carolina, *Public Discussion and Debate.* Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Record, no. 115, ex. ser. no. 6, 1914.
University of Oklahoma, *Student's Manual of Debating and Parliamentary Practice.* Norman: Univ. Ex. Div. Debate Bull, no. 12.
Whately, Richard, *Elements of Rhetoric.* Oxford: J. Parker, 1828. Many editions.
Willhoft, W. O., *Modern Debate Practice.* Prentice-Hall, 1929.
Wilson, L. R., *Public Discussion and Debate.* Raleigh, N.C.: Edwards and Broughton Co., 1917.
Winans, J. A., and Utterback, W. E., *Argumentation.* Century, 1930.

THE RADIO MEDAL OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY*

HAMLIN GARLAND
Hollywood, California

THE American Academy, founded nearly thirty years ago, has for its main purpose the promotion of literature and the fine arts and the preservation of records concerning American artists and men of letters. Like the Academies of France, Italy, and Spain, it is largely concerned with writing and one of the principal annual features is an address on some phase of written English. These addresses are distinctive and are given under the name of the Blashfield Foundation.

In addition to these addresses, it awards annually a gold medal for good diction on the stage and, alternately, to representatives of painting, sculpture, music, and architecture.

Its membership, made up of leading workers in the fine arts, is limited to fifty. It owns its own home, a beautiful building in upper New York City, designed by Mead and McKim and Cass Gilbert, and it has a substantial endowment. Its first president was William Dean Howells. Nicholas Murray Butler is its present head. Its board of directors, of which I was a member for fourteen years, is about equally composed of literary men and artists. Its secretary is Dr. Robert Underwood Johnson.

Six years ago at our annual meeting when Dr. Butler called for new business, I rose in my seat and made a suggestion which was new business indeed. I began by saying:

"In the morning paper a few weeks ago I read an amusing interview with one of the announcers of a radio station in which he described his reception in Buffalo while on his vacation there. He said in substance, 'You know I'm not much to look at—in fact I am distinguished only by my plain features. It follows that I am a shy man but from the moment I signed the register at the Sherman House, I found myself a personage. As a voice on the air I was a notable—a radio idol. Thousands of my fellow citizens who had never seen me crowded around to shake my hand. I could not eat half the dinners which they offered me. Crowds surrounded me as if I were a movie

*Delivered at the National Convention, 1932, in Los Angeles.

star but I could see disappointment in every face as my admirers saw me. Then and there I decided to retire from public view and remain only "the big noise".'

"This interview of which I have given only the substance, set me thinking. Up to this time I had regarded the microphone as a toy which was like to become a nuisance. I now began to consider the possibilities as a cultural agency. Upon inquiry I found that there are more than five hundred stations already in commission, employing more than two thousand young men who announce the half hour programs and comment upon the musical and literary features which fill some sixteen hours out of each day. Many of these announcers have won large personal followings. Millions of our citizens are listening in on these performances. These stations are in truth schools of high educational value.

"Three years ago we established a medal for good diction on the stage and I suggest that we establish a medal for good diction on the radio. I base this suggestion on the fact that these two thousand young men addressing millions of auditors every hour of the day can be made an enormously important agency in the teaching of good English among our immigrants and in our back-country districts. Our lately-arrived citizens are not trying to corrupt our speech—they are struggling to acquire its use—and these announcers can reach homes into which no other instructor is welcome. A medal calling attention to the announcers who are worthy of being examples of good English, would be of the greatest value to our polyglot population of this character.

"The French Academy," I went on to say, "has been engaged for many years on a dictionary standardizing the written language of France but I am of the opinion that our Academy being more democratic in spirit should take into account the values of the spoken word and call to its aid this latest and most appealing instrumentality for inter-communication—the radio—and the man who uses the microphone must be reckoned with."

After saying all this, I was moved to qualify my argument: "This may sound fantastic to you today but within five years you will find station announcers speaking to fifty millions of people on every conceivable subject. The radio will possess the future."

Some of the members, among them Augustus Thomas, himself

a distinguished orator, supported me in my position but nothing was done till a year later when I again brought the matter before the members. Re-inforced by the action of the English authorities who had appointed a committee of distinguished scholars and writers to pass upon the pronunciation and accent of the radio speakers, with stronger voice I said: "It is not merely a question of pronunciation, but of taste, of cultivation of tone. Americans are known all over the world for their strident voices. Our award should go to the speaker who combines pleasing tone quality with precision and scholarship in the use of words.

"The value of the award does not lie solely in the better speech on the part of radio announcers. The discussion which will follow the announcement of this award will be of the greatest educational potency. It will arouse all agencies whose purpose is the improvement of our spoken English. I submit that this is a vital service and I urge a resolution founding such a medal. In my judgment, such action on the part of the Academy is not only proper but a necessary step in its program.

"Standardization of the art of speech is the law of present day progress and the microphone is its prophet. As the daily press tends to standardize the written word, so the radio tends to standardize the spoken word. It is useless to deplore this process. It will proceed whether we like it or not. Our task is to see that it proceeds along the highest possible plane. We can no longer ignore an agency which has ten times the potency of the stage. From the establishment of a medal for good diction on the stage it is entirely logical to offer a similar award for good diction on the microphone."

At the close of my statement several of the members came to my support and a resolution of approval was voted. President Butler then appointed me chairman of a committee to study the situation and formulate a plan. He named Augustus Thomas, Bliss Perry, and George Pierce Baker as my associates.

In order to know the exact situation in the radio field we called upon Mr. Aylesworth, president of the National Broadcasting Company, to ask his advice.

Mr. Aylesworth had been called to Washington, but had instructed his assistant, John W. Elwood, to co-operate with us in every possible way. This was fortunate, for Mr. Elwood was not only a

genial young man but a man of keen perception. He instantly recognized the value of our proposed award but frankly stated the difficulties of judging candidates. "We shall soon have a network established from coast to coast," he said, "one which will enable you to listen in on all our leading stations but we are not in a position to promise it for this year. We shall do our best to broadcast the announcement of your plan and the details of the award." He then asked, "Have you seen the heads of the other organizations?" I replied that we had not. "You must see White, the head of the Columbia Chain. If you wish me to do so, I will take you over and introduce you to him." This offer we accepted gladly. Colonel White received us politely and at once agreed with Elwood that our award would be of the greatest interest to the announcers of every important station but frankly said, "Your job is difficult at this stage of the game. It can be worked out, however, and you may count on me and my associates."

My committee worked out a specific plan acceptable to the radio men and the Academy and after several weeks study this was printed and sent out to the managers of more than one hundred major stations, asking their advice and co-operation. Only a small percentage of these officials replied but those who did represented the leading companies in all the chief cities of the nation.

In the writing of this prospectus I adopted the method of question and answer and as these questions and answers are as pertinent today as they were then, I shall read them. They are the queries which every announcer and teacher invariably makes.

Naturally the first question then as now is: "Who can compete?" I answered it in as few words as possible. "Only regularly employed official announcers. Occasional speakers are outside the competition."

"What is the scope of the audition?"

"It is nation-wide. As the two great chains of the National Broadcasting Company and the Columbia Broadcasting Company are co-operating with us, we are able to cover a very large number of announcers and we hope ultimately to reach them all."

"Are there designated hours for judging the candidates?"

"No. The judgment is made during the regular hours of service. To obtain the fairest verdict and the best results, the Committee de-

sires the competitors to understand that they are subject to judgment whenever they are on the air."

"Who are the judges?"

"The official jury of award consists of the entire fifty members of the Academy. In addition, members of the National Institute of Arts and Letters act as an advisory committee and in addition the Academy has enrolled more than fifty distinguished university specialists in spoken and written English to serve as a corresponding committee."

"What is the method and basis of judgment?"

"Each member of the committee is provided with tally sheets on which a record is made and forwarded to the Academy. On these sheets the committee members will indicate their judgment in regard to the qualification of candidates in respect of (a) Pronunciation; (b) Articulation; (c) Quality of tone; (d) Accent; (e) General cultural effect. The basis of marking is a total of 100 with a possible maximum of 20 on each qualification."

"When does the presentation of the medal take place?"

"At the regular annual spring meeting of the Academy in April."

This announcement created a distinct and wide-spread interest. In every station announcers began to consider the quality of their own performance and to criticize the work of others. In many stations the announcers voted on the probable winner. Newspapers here and there ran straw votes and these were singularly illuminating.

One such poll conducted by a New York paper demonstrated that the announcer whose work was most popular ran sixth on the list while a man of quiet scholarship led the ballot. The readers of the paper had distinguished between the announcer of taste and judgment and the work of the "spieler." With this sense of values our committee agreed and Milton Cross of New York was the first medalist.

The award of the first medal was impressive. It took place in the beautiful forum of the American Academy and all addresses were broadcast by both the Columbia and the National systems. In response to our invitation both of these organizations sent their chief officials to speak a few words of approval and to offer fullest cooperation.

One of these men said to me the following day, "That award has raised the business of announcing to an art."

The contest of the following year, which was hotly argued, resulted in the choice of Alwyn Bach, a Massachusetts man of Danish parentage, a fine scholarly man with a noble voice. The winner in the third-year audition was John S. Holbrook, whose work was excellent on every count. None of the so-called "ad-libs" won any considerable number of votes. The committee held to its classification, saying: "The Academy stands for scholarship—not entertainment. Humor does not count, dramatic content does not count. It is not what a contestant speaks but the way he speaks it that is considered."

We were assured by many letters and clippings that the status of the announcer had risen and that his voice and method had noticeably improved. These were the effects we had hoped to produce.

It will be noticed that the first three medalists were all on the National Broadcasting Company's staff. This was natural, for not only did this company keep watch on the work of the entire field, thus securing the best men available, but also they trained them, criticized them and encouraged them to do their best at all times. While aware of the criticism which arose, my committee said, "If the National Broadcasting Company men secure the highest marking in these contests, we must continue to give the medal where the medal is due. Without question thus far the National Broadcasting Company has won the leading place."

Meanwhile the Columbia Chain was building up its rival group and this year the medal went to one of their men, David Ross, whose reading of "Poet's Gold" had made his voice known to most of our committee. Ross is a good man but in my judgment announces better than he reads.

Let it be noted that the Academy does not say, "to the best announcer on the air," but to the man whose diction gains the highest markings in the competition. The medal is given for good diction, not for the best diction and it is given not for ability to read well nor for dramatic skill, humorous or otherwise, but for clear articulation, correct pronunciation, freedom from local accent, pleasing tone-quality and for that pervading quality or blend of all those elements which enable us to say, "This is the voice of a cultured man."

You may ask "Why does the award always go to a man?" and I

can only say that for some strange reason women's voices do not come over well. The Academy has a medal for good diction on the stage and has given it to Edith Wynne Matthison, to Julia Marlowe, and to Alexandra Carlisle but thus far no woman's radio voice has won sufficiently high markings to make her a leading candidate. They all fail in the tone-quality; even Miss Matthison and Miss Carlisle were disappointing on the air.

In announcing the first award, Dr. Butler, President of the Academy said: "The preservation of English speech in its purity is for the Academy a matter of high concern. To resist the inroads of carelessness, slovenliness, vulgarity and nastiness is a task to which we must constantly and with every effort set our hand. Those whose duty it is to greet the public every day and almost every hour have unexampled opportunity to influence common use among our people."

In my short address before presenting the medal, I argued: "Only those who travel widely in America can know how discordant our polyglot nation is. A very large percentage of our people speak a broken English. In our great cities are swarms of tenement dwellers who never hear a correctly spoken English word except as it comes over the radio. Even among our native citizens the Yankee 'twang,' the Southern drawl and the flat *a* still linger. To all these provincial peculiarities the radio now offers contrast. My contention is that if a family habitually listens to a correct and pleasing radio speech, its members will unconsciously be taught just as they are benefited by radio music.

"What school of speech can compare in potency with the army of young men whose voices affect fifty millions of listeners every day? As their voices enter the lamp-lit circle of millions of homes, it is desirable that they should be cultivated voices. They set standards unquestionably and it is the duty of the American Academy and of all other educational institutions to see that the standards are high."

This brings up another question. Granting that the radio is one of the most powerful present day instruments for standardizing speech, what should the standard be?

Manifestly it cannot be British. The Oxford accent is not acceptable to the radio public and it is equally evident that we should not adopt the lingo of the New York subway or the accent of First Avenue. Neither should our standard be that of Vermont, Texas, or

Indiana. It should be a blend of the best usage of the Old World and the New.

On this point the director of a great university school of drama said to me: "My first task with every freshman is to sandpaper away his local accent. If he refuses to conform I say, 'I cannot cast you in a production. I can't have you reading Shakespeare with a Bird Center accent'."

When the first successful talking picture reached Hollywood, producers turned to near-by teachers of voice and speech, well knowing that no matter how well these crude little girls might photograph, they would be ridiculous as characters in a drama of cultivated society. Many delightful actors in silent pictures lost all their charm when they opened their mouths. English society queens depicted by uneducated girls from small towns of the Middle West or South were calamitously comical. In some cases the cast of English plays have been entirely filled by English actors resident in Hollywood.

Here enters another opportunity for the American Academy. As the radio and the talking screen are the most vital and all pervading agencies at work to debase or refine our public, I am personally advocating that the medal for good diction on the stage be awarded every other year to good diction on the talking screen. These are matters for Academic care and suggestion.

You will understand that the Academy is not concerned with the salaries of announcers, or actors, or radio managers of theatrical producers. We are concerned wholly with the improvement of American spoken English. Standardization does not mean destruction of individual charm but it does mean the doing away with ludicrous and displeasing habits of utterance.

The truth is, displeasing or ludicrous localisms are a serious handicap in any walk of life. A man may succeed in spite of an absurd drawl or nasal twang but he is carrying a useless burden in his race. Education of the ordinary sort does not insure an advocated manner of speech. Some of the ablest speakers I know have detestable habits of speech. The radio accentuates these stridences and localisms and the auditions established by the Academy have done much to make these unpleasant peculiarities of American speech evident and preventable.

Why should a crude unpleasant manner of speech make Amer-

icans a subject of jest all over the world? After all, our language is English—however much we may prate of making it American. What warrant have we for debasing it to the level of the frontier community or the East Side tenement? To glorify and defend our poor qualities is not a very high form of patriotism. If we are to have an American English, let us insist upon its being a noble variant, not an illiterate corruption of our inherited tongue. Against such a corruption the American Academy is at work and its medals for good diction on the stage, the talking picture and the radio are merely means to an end—that of encouraging the correct and pleasing use of spoken English.

THE RADIO INFLUENCES SPEECH*

L. B. TYSON
Station KHJ, Los Angeles

THERE are in America today over six hundred radio stations. The majority of these are independently owned, with approximately one hundred and seventy-five of them either owned by or identified with the National or the Columbia broadcasting systems. Each of these six hundred stations employs four to five announcers, on an average, so that there are between twenty-five hundred and three thousand announcers speaking directly to the American people for from sixteen to eighteen hours every day in the year. There are in the United States today over sixteen million radio receiving sets with an average of four listeners to a set or, roughly, sixty-five million people who are directly influenced by the speech of radio announcers.

This brief outline of the physical set-up of radio could be further enlarged by telling you of the thousands of artists, musicians, writers, technicians, executives, and others who go to make up this big and growing industry. I could go further and tell you something of the various types of programs, running the entire gamut of entertainment, education, current events, sports, and news. But most of you are already familiar with these phases of radio and I will proceed with the subject assigned.

My remarks concerning the effect of radio upon speech must of

*Delivered at the National Convention, 1932, in Los Angeles.

necessity be confined largely to the work of radio announcers, as they are the connecting links between the stations and the listeners. Radio announcers are quite often the target for jokesters and newspaper columnists. And quite often the criticisms are justified, for no one will question the fact that radio announcing in general could be considerably improved. On the other hand, it must be remembered, first of all, that radio is an infant industry and has hardly had time to establish very definite standards in respect to announcers or a standard form of speech.

Radio stations realize, however, that the announcers are their mouthpieces and that they must be very careful in their selection. One of the primary requisites of a good announcer is that he should have clear, distinct speech, a voice pleasing to the ear and with as much vocal personality as possible. On our particular stations we hold auditions, and from perhaps fifteen to twenty candidates we select one man.

A young clergyman applied for a position as radio announcer. The first lines he was given to read were the rhyme you all know,

> But the man worth while
> Is the man who can smile
> When everything goes dead wrong

—to be read buoyantly, cheerfully, with a pleasant, vigorous optimism. The clergyman began to read. It wouldn't do! It was prayerful instead of cheering, devout instead of buoyant. He was addressing an imaginary congregation from an imaginary pulpit. Radio's religious programs bring the clergy to the microphone in their own right and in their own role. It must not bring religious feeling to *all* programs.

The announcer we select must be well educated, be able to pronounce foreign words and phrases without the slightest hesitation, be capable of reading lines in dramatic presentations, and last, but not least, be a good salesman. As Tony Wons of Chesterfield fame pointed out in a recent article, many advertisers devote a great deal of time and money to the entertainment part of their programs with very little thought or effort given to the commercial copy or to the announcer who is to read the copy and sell the product being advertised. Radio announcers have so many duties to perform that it is necessary to be more careful in selecting them than in selecting any other class of employee in the station. And after they are hired they are carefully coached. On KHJ, for instance, we employed a well-known professor

of English to train our announcers in correct speech, voice culture, forcefulness, and the development of vocal personality.

Radio listeners, while they are most critical of announcers and programs, at the same time are easily influenced in their speech by what they hear over the radio. The reason for this is simply that they take for granted that radio announcers should know how to pronounce words correctly and thus accept them as a standard. Owners of radio stations are cognizant of this attitude on the part of the listening public and consequently feel the responsibility which rests on their shoulders for employing the most capable announcers available.

It is a well-known fact that radio has become one of the greatest educational mediums in the world today. It is one of the most powerful factors in moulding public opinion. Every word that is uttered over the radio has its effect upon some person's mind. You would be surprised at the letters and telephone calls which come to my attention each week, criticizing some announcer for mispronunciation, for some word or phrase used incorrectly, or for some breach of etiquette in speech. I think radio is doing more to influence people to speak correctly than any other medium I know. About 50 per cent to 60 per cent of the families in this country have radios and they spend an average of two or three hours a day listening to them. It would be beyond the wildest stretch of imagination to think that these same radio listeners would spend two or three hours a day reading a good book or studying. They are therefore relying upon radio to furnish whatever cultural improvement they might obtain from reading.

Such features as the "American School of the Air" constitute without question one of the finest educational programs that was ever devised either in the classroom or on the air. Thousands of schoolchildren listen to these programs. The adult audience is just as large. These programs embrace a wide variety of subjects, from music to botany, and are well thought out, planned, and presented. Programs such as "English Coronets" carry a very wonderful dramatization and elucidation of the most interesting events in the careers of famous English historical personalities. Programs such as "Plain Facts about Science" put into the mouth of the layman expressions relating to scientific phenomena that he would perhaps never get except by way of radio. Scientific men such as Dr. Einstein, Dr. Millikan, and scores

of others, bring to the layman in understandable terms explanations of scientific theories that could never be extracted from books. The human voice brings to life pertinent facts that lie deeply buried in cold type.

For music, Walter Damrosch broadcasts appreciation of music to over six million listeners, most of them children. Professor Irving Fisher of Yale tells workingmen of fundamental economic principles to the end that the policy of labor should be more intelligent. I could continue and name you hundreds of educational programs that are on the air today, all of which would serve to convince you that the radio has done and is doing an outstanding job of spreading education, which, of course, has a direct influence upon the speech of listeners.

Some very amusing incidents come up in connection with our educational programs. For over a year we have had on our stations a program conducted by a teacher of English. His programs were interesting, exceptionally well delivered, and helpful. One afternoon while he was on, my phone rang and a man's voice wanted to know why we permitted such programs on the air. I explained to him as best I could that radio stations had many thousands of listeners, with many different tastes, and that for eighteen hours a day we attempted to put on a variety of programs so that we could please as many of our listeners as possible. His come-back was: "Well, you do have pretty good programs, but this guy don't know nothing about what he is saying." I always refrain from anything bordering on the sarcastic in answering complaints from listeners, but in this particular case I suggested to the man that if he would listen to the program he would at least learn not to use double negatives.

It may interest you to know that the larger radio stations maintain a strict censorship over all copy that is read over the air, not only as to its content but also as to its grammar and from the standpoint of good English. We know that our listeners will be qick to call over the telephone or write us, directing our attention to any mistakes. You remember the early days of motion pictures, when it became a fad to watch pictures and see how many mistakes could be detected—such as an actor's appearing in a scene with a grey coat on and in the very next scene with a dark one. A great many radio listeners today are in the same category—they look for mistakes in English over the air, just as perhaps they did in the old screen days.

May I touch for a moment on dramatic presentations? Apart from the direct influence of announcers, this type of program has a tremendous amount of influence upon speech. Here the listeners can become acquainted with the niceties of speech, with the correct pronunciation of proper names, with the value of voice inflection, good enunciation, and forceful word-usage. They learn certain words and phrases that adequately describe certain situations. I know that I personally have learned many descriptive phrases from radio simply because as a part of a dramatic presentation they made an indelible impression upon my mind. My little daughter of four and a half uses words and expressions today that are far beyond the normal vocabulary of her years, not because she is a child prodigy but because she is hearing these words and expressions used over the radio and they naturally register upon her plastic mind.

International broadcasts have played a very important part in the cultural aspects of radio and its influence upon speech. The Columbia Broadcasting System has rendered an outstanding service to the American people by bringing to them, from abroad, programs by world-famous personalities and broadcasts of special events, which serve not only to enlighten us as to the habits, thoughts, and traditions of other races but also to freshen our speech with new and interesting words and expressions. These programs of course have to be very carefully planned and timed—because of differences in time—and quite often at the last moment something unforeseen will happen to put more grey hairs upon the heads of broadcasters.

Recently Mahatma Ghandi was to speak from London to our people. After all preparations had been tediously made and the schedules of the Columbia network had been carefully fitted around the international broadcast, it was discovered that Mahatma Ghandi would not talk at that time because it would interfere with his hour of private prayer. There was nothing left to do but to change the enire schedule for the day at the last moment in order to broadcast his message.

Two weeks ago an international broadcast was scheduled from the Dutch East Indies, with the Governor-General of Java named to speak. The Governor-General suddenly realized that he was being called upon to make a public address on Sunday—something definitely against his religious principles. True, owing to the twelve-hour difference in time between Java and the United States, we, his only

audience, would hear him not on Sunday, when his message left his lips, but actually on the day before, when it was received and broadcast in the United States. You can see that a delicate point was involved. The Governor-General refused to yield to persuasion, however, and that program was completed with a message from the Director of the Javanese Department of Government Industries instead. These international broadcasts are always most interesting and always instructive, giving listeners an entirely different perspective on foreign life, habits, and traditions.

Radio is not yet out of its swaddling clothes and still it has become a vital force in the educational and recreational life of the entire world. With the advent of television, which you will certainly see in 1933, radio will climb to even greater heights. It will play an even greater part in moulding public opinion; in encouraging Chesterfieldian courtesy and manners; in awakening cultural consciousness; in influencing speech for the better; and last, but not least, in stimulating much-needed industrial activity.

SOUND VALUES IN "THE CLOUD"

LUCY NEELY McLANE
Humboldt (California) State Teachers College

THE basis of intelligent vocal interpretation of literature is careful analysis. A reader cannot express shades of meaning that are not in the mind. Until he clearly perceives the motives and relationships of the selection, he cannot reflect them to others. Thorough thought and study of a poem previous to any effort of expression involves not only its meaning, the central idea, and its series of pictures, but also a comprehension of its organic structure.

In Shelley's "The Cloud" everyone must recognize the numerous iambic feet in a poem extremely anapestic in its effect and the aerial impression produced by these many unaccented syllables organically fitted into the four-three iambic bars of the music. To this extra metrical feature, one of the special advantages of English over French verse, is largely due the effect in the poem of light, billowing motion—now swinging aloft in ether, now cycling downward through lower air, again melting and penetrating all grosser elements. The other

sound-values are perhaps less obvious, though not less potent in evoking the mutable, shifting, yet ever mounting, action of the nature element which is the theme of this delightful, somewhat hackneyed, favorite.

When we seek the reason for the perfect turning-in, harmony with the dominant feeling of the poem, felt in the first stanza, we may be momentarily surprised not by the poet's unerring instinct for the vocable that best blends his object with the rest of animate nature—animate, for to Shelley the whole stuff of the world quivers with an indwelling, if elusive, spirit—but by the number of natural thing-and-motion names that begin with *s*: *sea, sky, star, shore, sand, snow, summer, sunlight, shade, streams, showers,*—the alliterating sibilants multiply and run into action by way of the *s*'s in *shine, shift, swirl, bask, dissolve, swing, struggle, sweep,* the mood of thing or act qualified by *soft, swift, sweet, sublime, aghast* and by phrases keyed to the sound of *s* as in "strips of the sky," "showers for thirsting," "from my wings are shaken the dews." Of the twenty-two action words, verbs and verbals, in the first two stanzas, thirteen themselves contain the letter *s*, linking with the same sound in conjoined words, four which lack the sound form part of phrases that are strongly alliterative in *s*, three belong to lines that contain at least one *s* to carry the thread, while only the two remaining, *wield* and *fettered*, both part of a transition in the action, have not the key sound.

All these whispering and thrilling sibilants that swarm through the lines lend themselves to a skilfully varied maze of kaleidoscopic movement. Here they contribute to the coming and going of "noonday dreams," the swelling of "sweet buds," the fall of "shaken dews," the thrill of "lashing hail" and "great pines aghast" in the storm. The contrasting aspects of loveliness and power felt in these two stanzas are otherwise wrought, the former by an effective use of the thin, clear, close vowel sounds *i* and *e*, aided by the liquids, the latter by the broad full vowels and struggling consonants.

The cloud by sound magic is blended with nature and endued with dynamic potency in the ceaseless drama of natural things while a sequence of pictures carries its action through its part in the major phases of the "divine day." As we move through this sequence the key-noting vocable sounds are less incessant. Even in the earlier half of the second stanza, the *s*'s are not quite so numerous; and when the

cloud, piloted by lightning, begins its earth-circling course under an influence from "the depths of the purple sea," the special effect of the turning-in has a diminished part, though it remains in force until the two more general stanzas are well blended by the linking sibilants into the wide setting made by the morn-to-eve third stanza. In this frame for more specialized cloud action, the new sound effects are: the gorgeous note of sunrise made by words combining *u*'s with *m*'s and *n*'s, an effect recurring with variation as sunset completes the setting; the liquid smoothness alternating with the rough force of *k*'s and *g*'s in lines three to nine that express the cloud's claim to be momentarily the bearer of sunrise itself; and the conjunction of thin and thick vowels which helps to picture airy height with brooding stillness at the stanza's end, where evening becomes the setting for the exquisite moon-advent celebrated in the fourth stanza.

At the beginning of this loveliest of moon romances, the fourth stanza, the cloud seems to retire in hushed consciousness of the supernal beauty of "That orbèd maiden with white fire laden." For her sake the fire of *i*'s is distilled with the dew of *l*'s and *m*'s, the pearl-roundness of *o*'s is confined by the etherealizing force of *b*'s and *r*'s, the invisible spirit of motion is caught in a net of *c*'s tied with monosyllables and rimmed by *t*'s, while all sounds together become sweeter than Keats's unheard melodies. Then swift action breaks forth again, and the very stars seem to whirl and flee as the cloud takes up the manifold word that is to culminate in the chaining of the powers of the air and the building of the arch of triumph, the million-colored rainbow.

In the fifth stanza, the architectural effect of more imposing words or compounds, aided by proportionately accented syllables, gains prominence over the delicacies of vowel-melody and consonantal check.

The last division of the poem shows the cloud seeming to issue from the milder and deeper, or the more delicate and aerial, commerce with nature into an open and self-explanatory phase, confident in the ceaseless change and the deathless appointed round of glad activity. Here the meter is more commonplace and the sound effects less magical, though they remain appropriate and send us with equalized pulses into the light of common day.

In this article the writer has confined herself rather closely to the

study of letter qualities even though the title lends itself to discussion of the metrical and rhyme effects as well, such as onomatopoeic niceties; e.g., line 1, st. 1, "I bring fresh showers for the thirsting flowers," *ow* repeated giving the connotation of pouring; line 7, st. 2, "In a cavern under is fettered the thunder," *und* voicing a rumbling. Per contra, there are infelicities; e.g., line 8, st. 1, "dances," wholly inappropriate to the earth's motion and ludicrously suggestive of nursery-walking scenes; but such an analysis will serve as the nucleus for further study in Shelley's "The Cloud."

RE-EDUCATION OF SPEECH FAILURES

BRYNG BRYNGELSON
University of Minnesota

AT the University of Minnesota we have met with the problem of handling students who for one reason or another have avoided taking a course in speech, who have failed, or who, having passed a previous course, nevertheless have felt the need for discovering their handicap in meeting a speaking situation with ease. During the past four years some hundred students have been treated in a quasi-clinical way, i.e., clinical procedure has been employed in a classroom situation.

The most interesting fact about these students was that they had failed to satisfy the requirement of an easy, free, and positive adjustment to a speaking situation because of a certain sensitivity. This sensitivity had been, since early childhood, centered about a nationality, race, name, or physical difference. In these groups we have had students who were sensitive because of their Norwegian, German, or Finnish ancestry. The Jewish and colored races have been represented. In these groups there have been students with uncomfortably different names such as Mehitable, Algernon, Percy, or Elmer. We found such differences in physical appearance as big feet, large noses, protuberant ears, red hair, protruding teeth, stuttering speech, receding chins, strabismus, long hair on the face, a prominent scar on the cheek, obesity, shortness in stature, an extra finger on either hand, baldness, and so *ad infinitum*. None of these various personality types were below average in intelligence; in fact, 5 per cent of them ranked

in the upper ten percentile in the placement tests at the University. Only six in this group were having difficulty in other courses. As far as we could learn, this was due to a general emotional instability which was discovered later to be due to their inability to adjust wholesomely to their physical difference. For example—one very tall person, six feet four inches in height, never dared to recite in Latin Class because he was sensitive about his height. As he said, "When I got up for the first and last time to give a Latin declension, I saw myself a sky-scraper, an almost limitless skyline, and all in the class pierced me with their dagger-like stares."

The most outstanding fact about all of them was that they had a burning desire to be able to address a group without feeling embarrassed, without "going all to pieces," and without experiencing what was an almost complete mental blocking. Many of them were introvertive, having been forced by their difference to live more or less away from social contacts. A few had tried overly hard to enter the social group, but because of their unconscious over-reaction to their weakness they had only succeeded in incurring disapproval from the group. One was known in his fraternity as the "buttinsky Percival."

Another noteworthy fact is that all of them had possessed these differences since early school days. Alice's red hair had always been red, and she had always hated the summer sun which made her freckles even more prominent. Joe's big nose had been large since birth, but until he entered competitive play he had not known that it was larger than the noses of his playmates. The five-fingered boy had always had that number of fingers on either hand. The obese girl had been fat from "time immemorial," as she so often referred to it. And too, we were very certain, both the teacher and the student, that these differences in actuality would never change, that the bow legs would remain bowed, and that the scar on the face would remain a scar.

It appears inhuman that teachers of speech should fail students in their courses because they are possessed with a difference in name, race, or physical appearance, and yet that is the accusation one is forced to make. Speech teachers have failed them, not knowingly perhaps, but nevertheless they have left speech classes unsatisfied and disheartened. What are we going to do with them? They challenge

us with their eagerness and their pathetic inability to satisfy the requirements of our courses, with their bewildered anxiety to reveal their true personality by means of audible and visible symbols. Would you propose to alter these conditions by surgery, diets, and physiotherapy? Would you encourage a student sensitive to red hair to spend hours reading about successful people in history with a similar affliction? Would you try to develop hidden talents in the big-nosed student in the hope that he would forget that part of his physiognamy? Would you in private conference attempt to bolster up an obese student by pointing out the advantages of being fat? Would you interest a club-footed student in the drama or forensic events in order to prove his worth in spite of his disability? Or would you feel more inclined to condemn the social group which has persistently looked askance at this student with a difference, which has ridiculed and mocked his speech or bestowed nick-names for his limp, his baldness, her freckles, or her plump body?

These technics have no doubt been employed for the want of another method. The fact is that all of the above-mentioned methods of treating sensitive students have failed. Unwholesome compensations such as false pride, overbearing conceit, over-talkativeness, or seclusiveness have been the resulting behavior patterns from these escape mechanisms which have been taught.

Let us attempt to understand the mechanisms involved. The social group considers as a weakness any marked difference in an individual who is bidding for entrance into the group. The group refuses to bring into its fold persons who arouse unfavorable responses. The group responds emphatically in two ways, depending upon the initial reaction of the individual who presents a difference. If, for example, the person has halting speech and is teased or mocked, and if he responds to the jeering remarks by becoming aggressive, militant to the point of fighting for his security, the group will retaliate. But unless the stutterer succeeds, either by sheer force or by cunning, in winning this combat, he is forever an outsider as far as the group is concerned. If he does win, he is allowed by his bullying behavior to rule the playground, but still he is not an accepted person in the group. His weakness now is more than a stutter; it is a social behavior. Or if the reaction should be in the opposite direction, namely that of withdrawing and seeking sympathy and solace from his teacher or parents, the

group is again the victor. The stutterer has failed in his adjustment—and each time he fails he grows more sensitive to his difference and the group succeeds in keeping its unity without him.

Just how could this individual with a difference bid successfully for entrance to the group? We see that his efforts in the two directions I have described have failed. My theory is that this person with a difference is entirely responsible for the actions of the group. That is, the person with a difference determines the reciprocal reaction of the group by the attitude he portrays when first attacked by the group. And I contend that the group would likewise have responded favorably to a frank recognition of the difference on the part of the individual. In other words, if the individual with a difference had admitted the difference and emphasized objectivity toward it, he would have had no need for compensation and thus the group would have reacted favorably toward him. In fine, I am proposing that if these persons with differences had been assisted in reacting frankly to their differences when younger, they would not have harbored such sensitivities upon entering a speech class in a university or college. There need be no problem in adulthood provided the direct method of meeting the difference has been employed when first entering the playground.

However, these speech students came to us with their difference and we had to help them. Upon analysis of these hundred students we learned that they had been the victims of inadequate methods in meeting their difference. The Norwegian girl had developed a false pride in her nationality. Her teachers tried to help her by pointing to the successful folk in Scandinavian history. But she was soon dubbed a conceited individual, and so she tried to simulate an Irish brogue, which she succeeded in doing well enough to be considered as of Irish descent in her speech class. The girl with protruding teeth had been allowed to muffle her naturally resonant voice by placing her hand up to her mouth.

Are we justified in failing a student who cannot maintain eye-contact that we require in a speaking situation? How can we flunk a red-haired person for being unable to respond to our speaking assignments? If we do fail them and we are not sure as to the underlying reason for their inability to do the work according to our standards—

then it is we who have failed, and the student is the victim of our lack of knowledge and technic in dealing with him.

Just as the group responded emphatically, so we respond when this individual with a big nose comes before us. If he shows a lack of positive adjustment, we react similarly. If he over-reacts to his difference, we too become militant, despite ourselves. If we would have the courage and understanding to help him see that it is his own attitude toward his difference which determines the attitude in us and in the class, we would be only fulfilling our natural obligations as professed speech teachers.

I wish to state briefly how this theory of the direct method of meeting a difference was applied to these students in whom sensitivities were present. In most instances these various sensitivities were revealed by means of autobiographies. In a few cases there was frank and immediate recognition of what was handicapping their adjustment.

First, it was necessary that the student and his classmates recognize that the ways in which they had reacted to the difference in the past had not solved their problem of sensitivity, that there was nothing else to do but to try a new technic if they wanted to gain the objective of freeing themselves in a social group. Exaggerated stimulation by audible and visible means was employed. This was done by having each student appear before a mirror. Standing there looking analytically and self-consciously at the red hair, the big nose, the big feet, or so on, he would talk about the difference, describe it in detail, and get thoroughly familiar with that characteristic so long neglected. The members of the class all participated in the discussion, calling attention to the difference as well as remarking about more normal parts of their persons. Nicknames befitting the differences were adopted, or if the sensitivity was about a name, that name was sounded in drill fashion at each day's session. The recounting of experiences when this difference had caused them some embarrassment proved of infinite value. Story-telling was employed by means of jokes centered around the difference. The stutterer would tell stuttering stories, and the fat person would tell stories in which obesity was the butt of the joke. Exercises and assignments in which the student would apply this objective attitude to social groups outside the classroom were used

towards the culmination of the therapy. In giving talks to other classes, the student always introduced himself with a reference to the thing about which he was sensitive.

Lastly, there was follow-up work in the form of conferences and contacts within social groups. I do not know what percentage of speech students would benefit by this type of speech training. I surmise that it is larger than one naturally expects, because I would propose to apply this theory to other problems connected with stage fright, such as inherent fear, blushing, and that general feeling of inadequacy due to under-rated social status or other unconscious conditioning factors.

Whether or not you should choose to apply the technic of this approach to speech problems depends a good deal, or I should say entirely, upon how well you, as a teacher of speech, are able to meet yourself with frankness and a sense of humor. I would suggest that this clinical procedure be pursued in an orientation course, prerequisite for other courses in speech, for those who might feel the need of this type of introduction to themselves and to the social group. I doubt that many speech teachers would care to pause long enough during a class hour to point out the direct method of meeting a difference to someone who was faltering before the class, and it might be inadvisable to take up too much time for individual therapy at the expense of the class program designed for well-adjusted normals. I wish to emphasize that what has been done in the past with these particular students has not been in the direction of facing the problem squarely. It has tended to run away from the real issues involved. This direct method of meeting a difference makes them face their differences in a new way. When this has been attained, the speech failure has been re-educated.

THE DOMINANT GRADIENT IN STAMMERING*

C. S. BLUEMEL
Denver, Colorado

IT will be remembered that when Alice made her entrance to Wonderland, she did so by crawling down a rabbit hole. When, a few years later, she explored Looking Glass House, she gained admission by climbing through the mirror over the chimney piece. After dusting off the White King in Looking Glass Room, she picked up a book which was printed in a language she did not understand. This of course was mirror writing, and soon Alice discovered that she could read the book if she held it before a looking glass. But even then the poem, "Jabberwocky," was puzzling, for it began as follows:

'Twas brillig, and the slithy toves
Did gyre and gimble in the wabe;
All mimsy were the borogoves,
And the mome raths outgrabe.

The poem is noteworthy as being one of the earliest examples of word-blind writing. "It seems very pretty," Alice said, "but it's rather hard to understand." Evidently Alice then pondered on the dominant gradient, for her next remark was: "Somehow it seems to fill my head with ideas—only I don't know exactly what they are."

How well we can comprehend Alice's dilemma, for we have many ideas ourselves, only we cannot clarify them. And how interested she would be in us, for many of us are training stammering children to the left-handed life, and this new race of looking-glass children would so nicely populate the inverted world that Alice discovered beyond the mirror.

The problem of left-handedness and stammering is fascinating because it appears so simple. The proposition is that, according to some investigators, stammering may result when a naturally left-handed child is required to give preference to the right hand. The situation becomes less simple when the proposition is contradicted by other competent observers. It is probable that the difference of opinion

*Delivered at the Annual Meeting of the American Society for the Study of Disorders of Speech, St. Louis, November 26, 1932.

arises from lack of available data on which to base a final conclusion.

Meanwhile this simple question is clouded by the theory of the dominant gradient. In some instances the acceptance of the gradient theory has led educational authorities, in advance of scientific knowledge, to the policy of requiring stammering children to adopt the left-handed life. The contention is made that although stammering may thereupon become worse, it may subsequently become better. But the fact that the stammering becomes better proves nothing in itself,—that is, nothing so far as the validity of the gradient theory is concerned. The history of stammering shows that all kinds of illogical procedures have benefited a certain proportion of stammerers, and when one views the field of therapy he is impelled to the conclusion that suggestion is often a potent factor. A particular form of treatment is therefore not necessarily rational or scientific because its application sometimes brings favorable results.

It would be better for the stammerer and better for the educator if the theory of the dominant gradient could be divorced from the question of handedness until more is known of the relationship between stammering and enforced manual reversal. The theory of gradients deals abstrusely with evolution, biology, and cerebral physiology, and it can throw little light on the question before us while there remains doubt on the cardinal matter as to whether handedness is actually involved in the problem of stammering.

I propose therefore to discuss the theory of the dominant gradient apart from speech, and afterward to consider the possible relationship that it may bear to speech disturbances. First of all, what is a gradient,—a subordinate gradient as well as a dominant gradient? To answer this question, one must go back to the controversy on evolution.

When Darwin advanced his theory of evolution by natural selection, his views were met with a good deal of criticism. Much of this was of an emotional character, based largely on religious objections. But there was also calm and thoughtful criticism, and this type of objection to Darwin's theory was persisted. It has been argued, for instance, that Darwin's evolution deals too much with morphology,—with the mere form or shape that animals assume. It has also been pointed out that his evolution is a negative or inactive process. Nature waits for mutations or variations to occur spontaneously; then she

perpetuates favorable traits through natural selection. All of this is too slow and uncertain a procedure. The modern biologist therefore accelerates the process of evolution by making it a matter of reaction to environment. Under this scheme the organism no longer waits for mutations which it may perpetuate; it effects its own mutations, and evolves itself. In the words of Herrick [1] "The living body shapes its own destiny and creates its own form and dynamic pattern." All this is accomplished by dominant gradients.

The dominant gradient is the business end of an organism. If a needle were an organism, then the point of the needle would be the dominant gradient. The less effective parts of the organism are the subordinate gradients. The eye of the needle therefore may be likened to a subordinate gradient. The blade of a knife is comparable to a dominant gradient; the handle to a subordinate gradient. The dominant gradient or business end of an organism is the point of greatest metabolism or bio-chemical activity. Thus in plant life the growing tips and root tips are viewed as dominant gradients. The balance of the organism remains subordinate to the dominant activity at these points.

In lower animal life the dominant gradient centres around the mouth, and in time there develops an oral end or apex which dominates the organism. Later the apex is presumed to evolve into a head, and the organism thereby becomes "cephalized." As the organism becomes more complicated it develops around an axis, and eventually it acquires symmetrical right and left halves about a median or central plane. At this point the theory of the dominant gradient ceases to have ready applicability. With the lowly organisms it was plausible and picturesque to consider them as nosing their way up through various evolutionary levels, but when they have developed arms and legs and right and left halves, they lose their apical points which formerly were regarded as dominant gradients.

It is now no longer possible to find a presenting point or locus which might be regarded as dominant, and in consequence the theory of the gradients becomes confused. In a measure the theory is sustained by designating one half of the body as dominant to the other. In another interpretation the nervous system is said to be dominant to

[1] C. J. Herrick, *Neurological Foundations of Animal Behavior* (1924).

other systems in the body. According to Child,[2] the brain cortex may be regarded as super-dominant. If this is so, then the left cortex becomes super-super-dominant, and the theory is seen to be under considerable verbal stress.

In a curious digression of the theory there is a tendency to rename the brain centres. Thus the auditory centre becomes the auditory gradient, the motor area the motor gradient, and so forth. Here there are new words rather than new ideas. Incidentally there is merely a change of terminology when the left half of the brain is said to be dominant to the right. Formerly the left brain was regarded as "functionally pre-eminent." With the adjective changed to "dominant," nothing is added to the original conception. Perhaps it might be argued that the term "dominant" has biological significance, but as a matter of fact the evolutionary direction of the gradient theory is lost when the discussion reaches the higher organisms, and although the theory begins with biology, it ends with cerebral physiology.

Even in its biological aspects the dominant gradient theory is of doubtful validity. One cannot accept the theory without first accepting evolution as a literal and orthodox principle. Having done this, one must accept the dominant gradient as something that makes evolution not merely orthodox in the old sense but dynamic in the modern sense. He must envisage a lowly organism which through its own efforts develops an apex from nothing in particular and a head from an apex. This same organism will grow legs from pseudopods and will develop visual and auditory systems from its primitive cells plus its own dauntless ambition. Vorticella may become a daffodil, and paramecium a neuro-psychiatrist. Such is the logic of evolution by "self-realization and fulfillment."

Contrary to the theory of dominant gradients it is necessary to assume that evolution proceeds at times through the action of the subordinate gradients. Thus it is affirmed that birds have developed from fishes through the mutation of scales into feathers. Here each scale or feather represents a subordinate gradient, and since these gradients act in harmony, it follows that the organism develops as a whole if these mutations actually occur. If such biological enterprises as evo-

[2] Charles M. Child, *Physiological Foundations of Behavior* (1924).

lution from fish to bird can proceed through the action of subordinate gradients, then the need for dominance disappears.

All of these speculations would be of little concern to us if the theory of the dominant gradient had not been taken from its evolutionary setting and adduced as a clinical theory competent to explain disturbances in writing and speaking. This adaptation of the theory demands our attention, and requires that we now turn to the matters of word-blindness, left-handedness, and stammering.

In 1925 Dr. Samuel T. Orton,[3] then of the University of Iowa, made a study of congenitally word-blind children, and observed that with their other difficulties these children frequently confuse the letter *b* with its mirror image *d*, and the letter *p* with its mirror image *q*. To explain this phenomenon he offered the ingenious explanation that the underlying difficulty was a confusion of the two halves of the brain, which are also mirrored images of each other. Orton assumes that in the two hemispheres of the brain there are "oppositely oriented nerve cell clusters" in which the memory record (mnemonic record) of words and letters occurs in right and left patterns or orientations. In one hemisphere the orientation gives a true memory image; in the other hemisphere the opposite orientation gives a mirrored image.

It is at this point that the theory of the dominant gradient becomes associated with the study of disturbances in writing and speaking. It is argued that if one hemisphere is definitely dominant, the child commands his true mental images and hence reads and writes normally. On the other hand, if there is lack of dominance or weakness of dominance, the child confuses the two hemispheres of the brain and consequently reads and writes at times in mirror fashion. With little further explanation Dr. Orton adds that stammering results from "comparable difficulties." This briefly is the history of the introduction of the theory of the dominant gradient into the field of speech.

Evaluating the theory with reference to word-blindness, one may object that mirror writing is but a small part of the total disorder.

[3] Samuel T. Orton, "'Word-blindess' in Schoolchildren," *Archives of Neurology and Psychiatry*, XIV (1925), 581; "Specific Reading Disability—Strephosymbolia," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, XC (1928) 1095; "Physiological Theory of Reading Disability and Stuttering in Children," *New England Journal of Medicine*, CXC (1928), 1046; "Special Disability in Spelling," *Bulletin of the Neurological Institute of New York*, I (1931), 159.

According to the present writer's observation, reversal of letters constitutes considerably less than one per cent of the mistakes in writing made by the word-blind child. An explanation of mirroring is therefore not a sufficient explanation of word-blindness.

One may also object to the literal interpretation that is placed on mirroring. It is assumed that the child is confusing the two hemispheres of the brain when he confuses such vertical letters as *b* and *d*, and *q* and *p*. This explanation suggests itself because the two hemispheres of the brain are vertically mirrored, and because we happen also to write a vertical alphabet. Looking further into the matter one finds that there is also horizontal mirroring. The child may confuse *m* with *w*, and *n* with *u*. Furthermore mirroring is found to occur in horizontal writing, such as one sees in Gregg shorthand. Here the confused word-forms are mirrored across a horizontal plane, and it is no longer possible to implicate the vertical hemispheres of the brain and consequently no longer feasible to invoke the theory of the dominant gradient. From these facts it appears that mirror writing has been misconstrued because we chance to write a vertical alphabet. On close analysis the theory of the gradients falls to pieces; and this, too, at the point where it is first introduced in the field of graphic speech.

If further consideration is given to the theory, it should be in the form of objection to the literal conception of cerebral physiology which supposes that memory records of words and letters reside in "nerve cell clusters" which mirror each other in the two opposite hemispheres of the brain. This primitive conception endows the cell functions with dimensional or spatial qualities, because the things remembered (words and letters) happen to have spatial qualities. If such reasoning is valid, one must expect the auditory areas of the brain to have auditory qualities. The brain surgeon, then, on exposing the temporal lobe, would hear a lot of little squeaks and whispers; on turning to the kinesthetic area he would observe pushings and pullings among the dendrites; and on exposing the olfactory area he would perceive little whiffs and sniffs as the cells maintain their engrams. This hyperbole illustrates the logic of the situation when visual cells and their mnemonic records are permitted to assume spatial orientation.

On the whole it seems that there is very little evidence to support the theory of the dominant gradient in the field of word-blindness.

What, then, is the status of the theory with reference to stammering? It is difficult to see that it has any status at all. The theory is applied to stammering on the assumption that it offers a satisfactory explanation of word-blindness, and on the vague assumption that word-blindness and stammering are attributable to "comparable difficulties." It is not shown that the difficulties are comparable, but the two disorders are coupled by a generalization that makes an explanation of one serve as an explanation of both. Actually, the introduction of the theory of the dominant gradient into the field of speech appears to be gratuitous.

So much, then, for the foundations of the theory of the dominant gradient with reference to stammering. The ground-work of the theory is principally the work of Orton. The elaboration of the theory is largely the work of Travis,[4] Orton's successor in speech work at the University of Iowa. In this elaboration of the dominant gradient theory, much emphasis is placed on left-handedness and change of handedness. Other writers before Travis linked stammering with left-handedness, but Travis goes further, and through left-handedness associates stammering with the dominant gradient. The explanation of stammering in terms of the dominant gradient and left-handedness is substantially as follows: Speech is initiated or controlled from one half of the brain. This is usually the left half of the brain, because the average normal speaker is right-handed. The stammerer, however, lacks a sufficiently dominant gradient; that is to say, he is not definitely right-brained or left-brained, or his physiological preference for a particular side of the brain may be weak. As a result of this the stammerer is often left-handed or ambidextrous. If, then, he is compelled by convention to become right-handed, his brain dominance is disturbed, and stammering results because of conflict or confusion between the two halves of the brain.

This explanation involves two considerations,—the dominant gradient, which is theoretical, and handedness, which is a matter of clinical observations. The theory of the dominant gradient has already been sufficiently canvassed, hence we may turn to the matter of handedness as a practical problem divorced for the present from biological speculation.

[4] Lee E. Travis, *Speech Pathology* (1931).

As stated previously in this paper, the status of this question of the relation of handedness to speech disturbances can be quite simply formulated: some investigators believe that stammering is related to left-handedness; others believe the contrary.

On the affirmative side it is asserted that stammerers are more frequently left-handed or ambidextrous than normal speakers. On the negative side this contention is denied. The question is not finally settled, but there appears to be a strong probability that left-handedness is common among stammerers.

The negative side then contends that left-handedness, if present, may mean very little. Some investigators have found left-handedness to be common with epilepsy, squint, high blood pressure, psychoneurosis, behavior disorders, and other conditions; hence the implications of left-handedness are uncertain, and its relation to speech may be not at all direct.

On the affirmative side there is the further contention that stammering often results when a naturally left-handed child is compelled to use the right hand. Bryngelson [5] cites a group of 200 stammerers in which 62 per cent were originally left-handed but had been required to shift to the right hand for most manual activities. On the negative side there are conflicting statistics. Thus Parsons [6] cites the town of Elizabeth, New Jersey, with a school population of 15,000, in which all children were required to use the right hand. Apparently this enforced dextrality did not result in a single case of stammering.

On the affirmative side of the question it is then argued that stammering sometimes results when a change of handedness is necessitated because of injury to the preferred hand. The contention is supported by a few sporadic examples. Information that I have been able to secure on this point supports the negative side of the argument. Insurance companies and industrial boards report that claims for injury to the hand or arm are not associated with claims for accompanying speech disturbance. I have collected no statistics. Statistical evidence is furnished by Professor Bestelmeyer [7] of Munich who cites a group

[5] See Travis, *op. cit.*, 139.

[6] Beaufort S. Parsons, *Lefthandedness, a New Interpretation* (1924).

[7] See K. Kistler, "Linkshändigkeit und Sprachstörungen," *Schweizerische Medizinische Wochenschrift*, LX (1930), 32.

of 1,200 one-armed persons among whom there is not a single case of stammering.

Finally on the negative side of this general question there is evidence that handedness develops considerably later than speech. Dr. Gerald H. J. Pearson,[8] working with Dr. Weisenburg, finds that among normal five-year-old children only 14.4 per cent are completely right-sided. Since five-year-old children already have fair command of speech, this study indicates that handedness and speech are not so intimately related as many have supposed.

An appraisal of these various arguments seems to warrant the conclusion that stammering may not be directly related to left-handedness or manual reversal. Nor is such relationship established by theoretical considerations of the dominant gradient. It follows, then, that the educator is not justified in adopting a wholesale program of converting stammering children to the use of the left hand. In espousing such a program he is not proceeding with scientific sanction, as he may suppose. On the contrary, he is working empirically, and he may do harm rather than good in training the stammerer to become a looking-glass child.

Before concluding this paper, I wish to remove the impression that I may have given of disparaging the work of those who have sponsored the dominant gradient theory. Far from disparaging this work, I regard it as of the highest importance, for the reason that it represents a new approach to the problem of stammering. In the early studies of stammering, the cause of the disorder was sought in the anatomy and physiology of the speech organs. In later researches, attention was directed to the psychology of speech. Finally, with the work of Travis, there is the neurological approach. Much has been learned and much is to be anticipated from Travis's scientific endeavors. Especially important, it seems to me, is his broad conception of stammering, in which the speech disorder is regarded as a manifestation of a deeper neurological disturbance. The nature of the disturbance is not yet clear, for many of the facts are missing. But gradually scientific knowledge accrues, and eventually the problem may resolve itself. My own belief is that much light will be thrown on

[8] Paper read at Annual Meeting of American Neurological Association May, 1932; not yet published.

stammering by studies in conditioned inhibition, and that the supposed conflict between gradients will prove to be a conflict between reaction and inhibition. But whatever the final status of the question, it is evident that the theory of the dominant gradient will remain significant as the initial attempt to solve the problem of stammering in neurological terms.

THE PROGRESSIVE TEACHER*

RALPH DENNIS
Northwestern University

IN my preliminary, and painful, ponderings upon the subject assigned me, I found myself estopped by the second word in the title of this paper, the word "progressive." Too vividly do I recall lectures heard and articles read in which progress was proved a chimera. Too painful is the present collapse of progress for me to take any vital interest in even a distant relative of that word. I am a burned child, and to me "progressive" smacks somehow of that classic expression "Oh yeah!" smacks of 100 per cent Americanism, smacks of the Women's Patriotic Corporation which recently sought to save America from Einstein.

Further, if I accept the definition of "Progress" (written thus) given by Huxley in a recent magazine article as "automatic amelioration, a notion that everything is all right and inevitably getting better," then indeed am I bewildered by our present world, by the change from cosmos to chaos. I am ready to agree with Huxley that the collapse of our faith in "Progress" affected our world more than did the nineteenth-century collapse of faith in the literal truth of the Bible. The discovery that the first chapter of Genesis was better poetry than science did not dissolve our scheme of values. But oh, what a loss is ours, my brothers, when we discover that our gods Progress and Prosperity, world without end, are false gods, and that there is an end!

In such mood I shy away from The Progressive Teacher, and there is no paper in me on the subject.

But I take hope. With no illusions concerning the perfectibility of

*Delivered at the National Convention, 1932, in Los Angeles.

man, with no hope in me of becoming a perfect man or a perfect teacher or a perfect anything—unless at times I claim the human prerogative of being a perfect ass—I am yet aware that there is change possible in the human being, change which may be for the better or for the worse, but nevertheless change; and I believe that the direction of this change can be guided by pushing, or leading, or gently nudging the individual; and that this guiding process may in the individual make for new concepts of work, of growth, of life, and of values. Because I believe these things I take hope and go ahead with this paper.

I go ahead not without difficulty, for how diverse a group I address when I speak to the teachers in our field! Here is the young teacher fresh from her class of "fourth graders" in creative dramatics; here the older man from his sound-laboratory; here the young man whose sole interest and work are in debate; here the teacher with primary interests in speech re-education, in the things of the theatre, in research; here, too, undoubtedly, is the teacher who must profess wisdom and skill in all these fields. What shall I or can I say which will appeal to this diversity?

I can repeat for you the conventional and timeworn truths of the need for solidarity in our profession, the need for support of state and national associations. I can say that our individual successes, our departmental successes, are most valuable and most necessary, but are still not enough. Or I can urge upon you further study, the acquisition of another and still another advanced degree. But if you are teachers worth your salt—as you are, or you would not be here in these times—you already know these things, are already doing them, or will do them when you can. Your views of yourselves and of your profession are such, your ambitions are such, that what can be done will be done.

True, there are people, a sort of dead-alive people, to whom all this has no appeal, folk who are whipped by life and circumstances into submissive dog-trotting along well-worn grooves of thought and routine, who do their jobs because the jobs have to be got through somehow, who teach with no glow, no enthusiasm, no love of the job and of its challenges. I cannot praise such teachers, nor do I blame them. They are. All you and I can do, perhaps, is to say, "I will not be one of them."

What, then, can I say which will not be old to you?

This, perhaps?

We work with material astonishing in its potentialities, human material, man. We work with one of the functions which make him man, speech. There lies all the challenge I need to make me a devoted teacher of speech. The first part of the challenge lies in the fact that we work with a growing, formable individual, boy or girl, college senior or graduate student, ready for shaping, ready to be molded. The material may not outwardly be too promising, nor too willing, nor too co-operative, but if we are artistic teachers, we find a way to make that material come alive, develop new interests, tap new powers. It has been done; it is being done; it will continue to be done. We the teachers become shapers and molders of human beings.

The second part of the challenge lies in the fact that we work in the field of speech, that function, as I have said, which makes us men, makes us more or less articulate. Our task, then, is to shape men and women in the various fields of speech, to help them find releases, to help them discover creative power, to help them attain new skills, new techniques, new patterns of thought, new scales of value.

A recent writer has said, "Read sympathetically, history becomes a fascinating tale of the human quest for life." Shall you laugh if I say, "Viewed sympathetically, every freshman class is a fascinating group hungry for life?" They want to know, though perhaps not what you wish them to know, nor as you wish them to know it. Every manifestation of that group is a quest for life, be it interest in football, in the other sex, in high grades or low grades, in discussions of vice or virtue. So viewed, our task seems to be to give the student new tools, new standards, new skills with which he may gain more satisfactions from life, with which he may give more to the living of life.

Conrad, in *The Heart of Africa* makes a character say, "The conquest of the earth, which mostly means the taking it away from those who have a different complexion or slightly flatter noses than ourselves, is not a pretty thing when you look into it too much. What redeems it is the idea only. An idea at the back of it; not a sentimental pretense but an idea; and an unselfish belief in the idea—something you can set up, and bow down before, and offer sacrifice to."

Equally true is it that what redeems teaching from being humdrum routine is an idea, a disinterested belief in an idea. I attempt to present one such idea, knowing that there are others of real potency, but also knowing that this idea, once caught and held, makes teaching in the field of speech a challenge, an opportunity, a privilege.

Filled with this idea and doing our job well, we must be lovers of our work and believers in its value. We must be filled with a passion, restrained or flaming, but so real as to be contagious, for the thing we do, the goal we see. I have seen this passion, and so have you. I remember, as you may, some kindergarten teacher, some high school teacher, some college teacher so possessed that students came alive, glowed with new interests, new thoughts, new ideas. And such real teachers in our profession do their task of making the dead awake in such diverse fields, such unpromising fields to you, perhaps, as research, logic, persuasion, debate, speech psychology, speech re-education, phonetics, voice culture.

If you are that kind of teacher, you are in love with your subject—just that. It is, as the late Stuart Sherman said, "the central fact in your existence." You have acquired some skill in your teaching methods and are on the hunt for more; you know much about your subject but will know more; last, you are a lover of this animal we call man, and believe in him. You are not a cynic. The cynic is the it-can't-be-done person, the man of no faith, the man who says of this or that venture, "The only thing in the way of success is human nature." You know that human nature can be petty, mean, selfish, vindictive, and cruel; but you know that it can also be magnificent. Be a cynic and your students are "poor stuff"; join the believers, join the men of faith, and it doth not yet appear what man shall be. That unpromising student may, under your influence, begin to grow; to start toward a maturity which will be deepened and enriched by work done under you. No potato in a darkened cellar reaches its shoots more instinctively toward a ray of light than a human being reaches toward the man of quiet faith, sure knowledge, contagious enthusiasm. Believing this you shall become a maker of minor miracles. Not a peddler of panaceas, of patent cure-alls, guaranteed to make the weak strong, the inarticulate eloquent, the dull alert, the unthinking thoughtful. No, not that. Rather this, a believer in the long process of growth for the individual and in a larger one

for mankind; a believer in planting seeds which may lie long ungerminated but may grow; a believer in opening doors, pointing ways, developing skills and attitudes which will take long to come to full fruition if they do at all, so stumbling is man. None the less, the teacher who believes works on, not failing in faith, willing to wait for the final harvest. His is the mood of the well-ripened man, so excellently expressed by Stevenson:

> And the true conclusion is to turn our back on apprehension, and embrace that shining and courageous virtue, Faith. Hope is the boy, a blind, headlong, pleasant fellow, good to chase swallows with the salt; Faith is the grave, experienced, yet smiling man. Hope lives on ignorance; open-eyed Faith is built upon a knowledge of life, of the tyranny of circumstance and the frailty of human resolution. Hope looks for unqualified success, but Faith counts certainly upon failure, and takes honorable defeat to be a form of victory. . . . In the one temper a man is indignant that he cannot spring up in a clap to heights of elegance and virtue; in the other, out of a sense of his infirmities, he is filled with a sense of virtue that a year has come and gone and he has still preserved some rags of honor.

In this well-weathered mood, neither bumptious nor defeated, I would have myself read Lindsay's lines till I know their every meaning, their every implication:

> Let not young souls be smothered out before
> They do quaint deeds and fully flaunt their pride.
> It is the world's one crime its babes grow dull.
> Its poor are ox-like, limp and leaden-eyed.
> Not that they starve, but starve so dreamlessly;
> Not that they sow, but that they seldom reap;
> Not that they serve, but have no gods to serve;
> Not that they die, but that they die like sheep.

And so believing, so ripened, so heartened, so inspired, I go to my classroom certain in the knowledge that I am working in a field which offers me rare opportunities for the shaping of human beings; glowing in the assurance that in so teaching I am making my modest contribution to those before me.

There exists a country, so I have read, in which citizens are ranked according to the value of their contributions to the state. That ranking places farmers first, teachers second, and, after further categories, at long last, soldiers.

There nestles among New England hills a town I know. It has been there more than one hundred years. Through its schools have

passed many generations of students. Out into the world they have gone to do their jobs, farmers, housewives, laborers, artizans, professional men, writers, business men. Some have become nation-known, some state-known; some remain unheralded, unsung. Who had more to do with the forming of these citizens than the able teachers who loved their jobs? Next to the tillers of the soil, they are indeed most necessary to the life of a people.

Let us remember that. But I need no assurances from outside me to make me realize the contribution of good teachers. I know the contribution they make. And so knowing, I shall make every effort to be a good teacher. And trying thus for excellence, I shall continue to find great satisfaction in my chosen work.

WE GO TO MARKET*

CLARENCE T. SIMON
Northwestern University

THESE are interesting times. The health curve is rising and pocketbooks are getting flatter. We drop demagogery and bureaucracy as mouth-filling conversational terms and attempt Technocracy. Business waits to see what will happen when we change toboggans in the middle of the slide. Schools trim budgets and the dull thud of dropped departments is a minor obligato to the sound of the teaching voice. Members of each profession are sure they are the hardest hit, and long faces and tall stories are the order of the day. It's a complete morning after. Industry and schools alike drank too deeply of a common cup.

Prior to 1929 expansion was the keynote. Growth was measured solely in terms of physical expansion and volume. Departments, side-shows, and auxiliary interests multiplied. Orders flowed into factories and students poured into high schools and colleges. Everybody was to be educated, but no one asked what that meant. School boards and legislatures chanted "bigger and better" and were off on the mad orgy. Buildings and equipment were demanded and supplied. We believed in and worshipped externals and overt things.

*Delivered at the National Convention, 1932, in Los Angeles.

Industrially and educationally we were off to the expansionist's millenium. "We are the greatest people; nothing like us ever was."

It's easy to see that now, of course. And there is neither virtue nor prestige in displaying or discussing what was. Hindsight is useful for only two purposes; memory or vision; either as a solace and a means of retreat from the present, or else as a back-sight to chart the future. I think we can dispense with the former, but we should try at least to use the second.

Certainly the days are gone when the market comes to either industry or the school system. We must now go to the market, and in many instances we must create that market before we can go to it. In this trek the virtues of industry, initiative, and hard thinking are useful accompaniments. The rather corpulent, bejeweled and bejowled pre-depression edition of the *genus homo* is giving way to the slab-sided, lantern-jawed figure of the pioneer. And that low moaning sound that we hear? Cerebration and spirituality, long unused, can protest as loudly as flabby muscles suddenly compelled to do a day's work.

We are in a situation which requires hard work and straight thinking. Not everyone is willing to do it. On the way to a discussion of the contribution of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION to the marketing problem, I want to stop to register a purely personal conviction. I believe that we as individuals depend too much on organizations with which we are affiliated. In times like these we are apt to overlook the fact that maintenance and advancement are pretty largely individual affairs. The fight for prestige, for gains, must be waged on many individual fronts. I am not blind to the benefits of organization and concentrated power. Quite the contrary; I believe in co-operative effort, as will be quite clear before I reach that place technically known as the conclusion. But I do believe that we are too prone to wait for an association to reach down and straighten out our individual affairs. Miracles do not happen while we sit with folded hands and an expression of rapt expectancy on our faces. Perhaps this is a typically human characteristic, "to pass the buck," but it can be crippling. Too many teachers have blamed the ASSOCIATION for what was really a lack of individual effort. And as I talk of the role of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION I am assuming that activity there is matched by initiative and toil on the part of the members.

There is no question but that the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, as an

association, must go to market. And if we are going, we want to go with our best wares, and display them to our best advantage. That seems to me a truism. Of course, opinions concerning our wares and methods of display will differ, and some of us may become quite heated in the discussion. We may even say quite nasty things and think we are settling the problem when we are only hurling epithets. That has happened in the past. There is nothing like a good sonorous epithet to relieve our feelings, but after all verbal catharsis seldom clears the issues. Some of you may have a few choice ones to send in my direction in the next fifteen minutes. Well, I don't mind—much. I am simply trying to think my way through a problem. Whether the ideas presented will be rewarded with brick-bats, laurel, or funereal lilies is a matter of passing concern.

I hope you will understand that any comments I make are my own; for tactlessness or witlessness I apologize and assume full responsibility. The ideas represent no organization, institution, bloc, or group of lobbyists. I have no axe to grind, no ulterior purpose to serve. I ask nothing of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION or of this convention save a thoughtful consideration of the quite impersonal results of some post-presidential meditations. We go to market; how do we go?

Within the lifetime of our organization, four changes have occurred which should be recognized and used in our planning. The first one concerns the nature of the job. A few years ago we taught speech plus English, mathematics, language, what not. Very few, if any, taught speech and nothing else. Such jobs simply did not exist. But now many are teaching speech exclusively, and even specializing in some one phase of the field with but secondary interest in the others. In the larger departments we are divided clearly into teachers of public speaking, of drama, of interpretation, pedagogy, speech pathology. And even these groups are subdivided. Debate and history of oratory are handled by different men; the play director does not teach design, and the literature of the theatre is reviewed by yet another. And so it goes, a tremendous division and specialization within a few short years. Of course, as is general in evolutionary processes, there are wide variations. We have almost any situation we can mention, from the one-man department trying to cover several phases of speech, through the same-sized department devoted to one phase, and on to the most highly specialized. But regardless of the

extent of the specialization, these groups are class-conscious. Separate organizations on a subject basis have been formed and are in the offing. It seems to me that all these groups should be in, and an integral part of, the parent organization. A national speech association is inconceivable on any other basis. And as a corollary to that—the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION should not be dominated by any one or two of these groups to the exclusion of the others.

A second change to be reckoned with concerns the school level. The organization started with college teachers; they fostered it and carried it, spending liberally of both time and money. And all honor to those who did it! Their virtues are rare in the world. But we have spread toward secondary and elementary schools. We have invited, nay urged, the secondary and elementary school teachers to join with us. We have talked largely about gains to them; we have stressed their importance. We have been long on talk, but a bit short on action. When issues have come up, they have been settled from the point of view of the college teacher. In an organization run by and for the college teacher, others have "slim pickin's." And yet, to my way of thinking, a national association that does not include on its membership list, in its program committees, and on its executive councils adequate representation of these secondary and elementary school teachers is assuming a name to which it has no right.

A third change concerns the geographic basis of our organization. The past years have seen the advent of both state and regional associations. These have been greeted with mixed feelings by our members. They have been praised and blamed for many things; they have endured over-enthusiasm of both the positive and negative varieties. But they are here. We have accepted the regional; we should include the state. There is no question but that the most intimate contact with the great body of teachers will be maintained by state organizations. The national organization dare not disregard them.

A fourth change concerns the focus of effort of the members. Does it shock you to realize that some of the members of our NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH are not teachers of speech at all; and many more of them are not so in their major interests? Specialization within departments, the growth of graduate work with its emphasis on research, and developments in the theatre have resulted in the clarification of at least four groups: teachers, performers,

technicians, and research men. This growth is inevitable, and will continue. We have not as yet recognized it within our ranks.

These are some of the changes which we must consider as we go to market. All of these diverse groups are in the Association, but not intimately a part of it. They have not as yet found an adequate and satisfactory professional home within its borders. And if they do not, their memberships, affiliation, and loyalties will drift to the National Educational Association, American Psychological Association, Modern Language Association, and similar societies. In fact these learned societies, and others, are making overtures to speech, opening places in their programs to men from the field of speech, and providing opportunities for discussion and information which may surpass those offered by our own group. Now whether you are in a mood to call these movements of other societies overtures or encroachments does not affect the problem. The real problem is the activity of our own Association.

These changes have been happening without much influence on our thinking. Many of us are still automatically considering our Association as it was. Mentally we may assent to the fact of change, but in terms of action and behavior we are still emoting on the old basis. We have lost the advantages of the small intimate organization, and in trying to recapture them, we are very apt to let slip the advantages of the larger and more complex group. We can no longer go to market as we were.

Now I am not going to take your time or my energy to argue what is the ideal form of organization. That question is too closely linked with our habits and prejudices to be settled out of hand. It must filter through more minds than one. Naturally, I have my own idea, and the fact that I have gone this far shows my own bias. However, that is one man's opinion—worth just one vote on the convention floor. But since I have got in this deeply, it seems only fair to continue with some suggestions for adapting the Association more closely to the present conditions.

In the first place I believe that our organization should be a looser federation, with definite recognition of the diversities in our ranks. Why should we not take a leaf from the book of the A.A.A.S., for example, and have subject-matter divisions? I see no harm in having a Chairman of the Public Speaking section, of

the Drama section, and of the others; all of these chairmen administering the affairs of the particular groups, and leaving the national president free to be a real administrative officer. It seems to me a small point of view that condemns the national president to consider the details for all groups, to evolve the program for all fields. It is a waste of administrative effort and would not be tolerated in any office or industry in the country. We need all the energies and vision of our national president to meet our national and associational problems. In other words, the Association has grown to the place where decentralization not only is possible, but necessary for efficiency. I sincerely believe that this move, with all its implications, is the only one that will prevent the disintegration of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION into a number of small organizations, meeting independently, and planning without reference to their fellow workers. It is the only way we can keep the field of speech from straggling to market as a disorganized group of petty peddlers. You may call me a radical, or some other choice name. I beg your pardon; I am simply coming down out of the ivory tower to go to market.

Again, I believe that our organization should take greater cognizance of the secondary, elementary and junior college teachers. We need them in the Association; they should need us. This recognition should be in the form of greater support and backing to the various committees, of increased representation on executive council and program committees, and greater interest of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION in problems purely in these fields, an interest shown by publications, exchange of information, and probably some system of special memberships.

Another change in our organization which seems to me imperative is a mechanism for a close geographic tie-up, not only with our various regional federations, but also with the state groups. Many of our potential members are so situated that they can rarely, if ever, travel to a national meeting. Many of them are at present remote from national problems, activities, and interests. But they know the conditions in their own states, they know the assistance they need and the contributions they can make. I can visualize an organization of the field of speech with the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION as a center and a correlating body, fusing the activities and power of the regionals, which in turn are the focusing point of the state

organizations within their respective territories. It is not an impossible dream that every teacher of speech, every worker in the field, should belong to his state organization, receive its services and publications, and deal immediately and effectively with his local problems; that, through that state organization, he should be affiliated with his regional group, and go to its meetings; and finally through some form of combination membership, be a member of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION. What a tie-up for power and effectiveness! The advantages are obvious. The state groups gain in solidarity, in unity with their neighbors, and in the results of co-operative effort. The National gains through extensive membership, and through contact with problems at their inception in local areas. With an organization of this type, we can take the National meetings where we will, and accept the hospitalities of the various regions and still feel that we are handicapping no one, and condemning no district to go conventionless for a period of years. It is inconceivable to me that the present lack of consolidation between the various geographical divisions is more than a transitional phase of our growth.

These, then, would be the recommended changes in organization: a looser federation recognizing the existence of varying subject-matter groups; an administration of activities that will make a larger place in membership, in policies, and in exchange of information for the elementary, secondary, and junior college teacher; and, finally, a system of combination memberships so that every worker in the field of speech is at once a member of his state, regional, and national associations.

But there are additional elements in this picture of a National Association. We need at least three publications in place of our one. We must keep our present quarterly, it has served us well, and there is a place for it nothing else can fill. But, to meet our program, we should have a bulletin, magazine, whatever you wish to call it, devoted to the interests of the secondary and elementary schools. This should appear at regular intervals, be edited by its own staff, and be addressed to its particular audience. We need also a research journal to care for the increasing volume of literature of research and technical interest. A learned society without at least one purely research journal appearing regularly is an anomaly. These three publications at least are demanded. How pay for them?

Let each membership carry with it a subscription for one of the three, with one or both of the others to be added for additional fees. The present quarterly fills admirably the needs of the general college teacher, and that group will purchase it. Secondary and elementary school teachers will take their own, research men, technicians, and supervisors of graduate study will take the research numbers. Some of us, the incurables, probably will take all three, not only because we want to read them, but for the same reason we now contribute to sustaining memberships.

And now I come to a suggestion that will make some of you smile, and will irritate others. Impudent as it may seem, I am going to suggest a change of name for our association. I should like to hear it called the NATIONAL SPEECH ASSOCIATION. This has dignity and brevity, and is in step with the general tendency among academic societies toward simple titles involving the name of the particular discipline. It also recognizes that we number in our ranks workers of many groups and many interests. I realize the sacredness of a name, and know full well that much argument was spent on the present form. But is seems to me that the vision of growth and scope epitomized in the NATIONAL SPEECH ASSOCIATION renders it worthy of consideration.

One more recommendation, and I have finished. For a good many years we have been fighting for a place on academic rosters; we have talked speech curricula, specialization in preparation and activity, recognition of speech courses and programs, till we may have become slightly myopic. But we were driven to it by the necessity for survival. Our clannishness, subject-consciousness, and general pugnacity were the price of our continued existence. But no longer. Even though these are times of depression, and we are feeling frequently recurring economic shocks, the field of speech is no worse off than any other, and there are indications that we are better than some. We are rather firmly embedded in the scholastic scheme. We have builded well and solidly. It seems now that we should begin to think in terms of curricula, not courses; in terms of school programs, not departmental activities. In its concepts and policies, the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION and its members should consider relations and integrations with other academic interests. Modern curricular revision in our public schools began about a decade ago. Now the talk is increasingly of units, programs,

and the like. The old, sharp division lines are going. The day of the highly specialized speech courses in the general run of schools may be gone; are we ready for the adjustment? Are we ready in either vision or training to take our place in the modern integrated, objectified curriculum?

You may not agree with these concepts of reorganization, additional publications, change of name, and attention to relations with other academic disciplines. No matter. Will you think about them? Will you try to consider them, not from habit or prejudice, but solely from the view of an organized group selecting its best wares to market in the sanest and most attractive manner? If we can do that, we can go to market as a NATIONAL SPEECH ASSOCIATION, and a truly great organization.

THE FORUM

A PRONUNCIATION POLL

Editor of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

The publication by the National Council of Teachers of English of *Current English Usage*, a poll of expert opinion on disputed points in grammar and punctuation, suggests to me that it would be highly desirable for teachers of speech to make a similar study of pronunciation.

The Leonard committee gathered the opinions of representative linguists, teachers, editors, and authors on some 200 or 300 disputed usages, and discovered that many practices condemned by our composition texts are approved and used by a large majority of these qualified judges. The teacher, says the report, may well ask himself "whether it is worth while trying to teach rules which great numbers of educated men no longer observe."

It is agreed, I suppose, that there is no satisfactory authority on American pronunciation. This is largely because language changes and grows, while dictionaries and other authorities are slow to catch up with it. But meanwhile much time and energy are spent in teaching pronunciations which the mass of cultured men and women do not accept, and much uncertainty prevails as to the proper pronunciation of new words, and the extent to which old ones may be modernized.

Why not, then, a poll of the best authorities on certain disputed pronunciations concerning which all of us have, or should have, doubts? Of course we cannot decide by law or majority opinion that certain pronunciations are right or wrong. But we might discover whither pronunciation is tending, and avoid the inordinate waste and confusion in teaching that certain widely accepted usages are wrong because our obsolete dictionaries do not approve them. We might discover the prevailing usage on such newcomers to English as *garage, chauffeur, automobile, aeroplane, chassis*, etc., and help to standardize it. We might learn whether it is longer profitable to resist the popular passion for accenting such words as *address, adult, detour* on the first

syllable. And we might learn whether anybody pretends to pronounce such words as *cheer, clear, fear* and *class, last, path* as they are marked in the Webster Dictionaries. We might even learn what ought to be done with *data,* and the last syllable of *literature.*

It is not likely that we would learn anything new as to regional differences, but personally I should like to count noses on the question as to whether final *r* is really a painful sound, and whether *door* should rhyme with *dare.*

It seems to me that a poll of leading linguists, phoneticians, lexicographers, literary scholars, actors, radio announcers, and speech teachers on these and other problems might help materially to establish many disputable pronunciations as either acceptable or illiterate.

Such a study of pronunciation would merit, and receive, wide publicity, and should help to advertise the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION as students and conservers of American speech. Could our funds, if we have any, be better spent than in making such a study?

W. M. PARRISH, *University of Pittsburgh*

WHY NOT READ IT?

Editor of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

May I set down an imaginary conversation that could not possibly have taken place at the National Speech Convention, Los Angeles, December 27-29, 1932?

It was during one of the few lulls in the busy program that I noticed him walking along the hall. He had caught my attention before, for his was a striking person, and he had shown interest in the meetings, both general and group. As he turned from one of the doors he caught my eye. After a moment's hesitation he came over and asked, "Pardon, but would you be so kind as to tell me what this convention is?"

"Certainly. This is a national speech convention."

"Pardon again, but did you say speech?"

"Yes, certainly."

"I had seen something about it, but as I looked in the various rooms and saw and heard papers being read it rather confused me and I wanted to make sure."

Down deep within me there came a feeling of impending conflict. I resolved immediately that it would be in the nature of a Socratic discourse. Evidently this person objected to some of our practices. I would, by skilful questioning, be a Socrates, defending that which was accepted as correct by practice and opinion of the leaders of our field. I began, therefore, though afterwards I realized it was rather rude—

"Would you not agree that the reading of a paper tended to give more weight to the matter under discussion?"

Such a leading question made me feel very Socratic indeed. I felt quite proud (that was before I realized the rudeness). The awakening was somewhat of a shock.

"No, I could hardly agree to that, unless the paper was of a technical nature, in which case it would be better to have printed copies so they could be studied at leisure."

"But surely you will agree that accuracy is all-important?"

The stranger must answer "yes" to this question. I had the next question all framed. "Therefore, is it not better to read for the sake of accuracy?" But something went wrong.

"If by accuracy you mean statistical perfection, I would agree. In agreeing, however, I would again point out that the printed material would allow for detailed study. If by accuracy you mean the rhetorical construction of the paper, I would say no."

Somehow the next question didn't fit. In the pause that my poor brain needed to pick up scattered threads of argument the stranger found opportunity to ask a question.

"Do you have some official magazine in which these papers may appear after the convention is over?"

"Yes, certainly. The QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH takes most of them."

"Would you say the printing made the presentation at the national convention unnecessary?"

The feeling of being Socrates had left me. Thrasymachus was my forte just at this point.

"Of course not. If we did that we would miss much from the convention.

"You feel then that the convention needs these groups and general sessions where papers are read?"

"Yes, I do."

"Let us leave this for a moment. I'd like to know what you feel the real purpose of the convention is."

I *would* be Socrates.

"You've been here two or three times. What do you think it is?"

I found that it took more than a question to make one Socrates.

"It's all too complex for me. You are in the field. You must answer."

"It appears to me this way. First, inspiration. Second, knowledge. Third, knowing people. Fourth,—but I guess those are the most important."

"And would you say these papers contributed to all three of these purposes?"

"Without question, particularly the first and second."

"Inspiration comes from reading of these papers, think you?"

"I have no doubt there."

"If the material were given with the freedom of extempore speaking, directly to you, would not the inspiration be greater?"

Very definitely I felt like Thrasymachus.

"But you're trying to dodge, by asking about inspiration, the fact that in a paper read there is a guarantee of careful thought, put into good shape; and furthermore finishing on time is guaranteed."

My mind went back to a Forum discussion in the JOURNAL for 1929 in which these points were made by a leader in the work. I felt quite proud of them. The visitor was not impressed.

"I'll take up your so-called values in a moment, but first let us clear up inspiration. Which is the greater inspiration, provided the extempore speech met all the conditions you mentioned above, it or the written paper?"

"It is my frank opinion that the extempore speech would give the greater inspiration."

"I do not see how you could soy otherwise. I have read some of your literature and no other conclusion is possible when you tell the student what to do through the medium of your textbooks. But perhaps that is for the students alone?"

I ignored the question. He also, having said it, ignored it, though

I saw a twinkle developing that boded little good for my Socratic ideals.

"Let us come back now to your claims, having admitted that if the extempore speech is well prepared it has more inspiration. You say that the written speech is guarantee of work well done?"

"That's right."

"Now! Do you mean to imply then that anyone in your field, asked to speak at a national convention, would do else than prepare his level best, regardless of the method of delivery?"

"I'm not sure that I get your point?" This was a stalling for time.

"Perhaps I was not clear. I simply stated that it didn't sound reasonable that anyone asked, and honored in the asking, to be a speaker on the program of a national convention would do anything but give his best, regardless of the method of delivery."

I couldn't stall for time any longer. "I suppose, putting it that way you are right."

"A speech teacher, or one in the field of speech can give an extempore speech, I take it?"

"He ought to be able to, particularly in his own particular specialty."

"So, then, the careful thought, guarantee of work well done, put in good shape, is guaranteed no more by the paper than by the extempore speech, provided the preparation is done in the way that anyone honored by appearance on the program should prepare. Doesn't that follow?"

These direct questions were disconcerting. I suppose it was about here that I realized I had been rude with mine at the beginning of the conversation.

"Well, I—"

The stranger broke in.

"That would be a dangerous admission, wouldn't it? Frankly I wonder if the writing of a paper doesn't take less time than preparing a satisfactory extempore speech would take. Perhaps—mind you, just a perhaps—perhaps speech people do not care to spend that time, energy, thought necessary to give what they themselves claim is so important, the good extempore speech."

"I really believe there is some element of injustice in what you say, though from the outside, it might appear that way."

"I will admit at least one accusation of injustice. I have left out one advantage, that of staying within the time set. Speaking of time, I'm afraid we must end this very interesting conversation as the next session should be starting, and I'm interested in one of the 'papers'."

My heart failed me.

"I'm sorry in more ways than one, but at the general session, because we had run over time before, and one of the men there went quite some over time, we've postponed this session until lunch tomorrow."

"That's too bad. But it supports your contention. That man gave an extempore talk?"

"No. I'm sorry to say he read his speech."

My friend was kind. Without so much as a smile he said, "Since we have some more time, I'd be interested in going back to one or two points of controversy. Your claim of accuracy seems to be the most important claim left for the reading of papers. You say that you are guaranteeing accuracy by the reading."

This was safer ground, though I had long ago given up any idea of being even a distant relative of Socrates.

"Certainly. We feel this is very important."

"But wouldn't you say the printed page was more accurate? However, waiving that momentarily, what is accuracy?"

"Accuracy—it's, well, if a man is talking on chest resonance, dealing with technical terms he must be accurate."

"Undoubtedly. As you listen do you remember these terms?"

"Sometimes."

"And other times?"

"If it's important I feel that I'll have an opportunity to read and study it in the JOURNAL." This slipped out before I was aware.

"You'll read it in the JOURNAL. So what has been gained by the accuracy of the read paper?"

"After all, admitting your point that accuracy of technical terminology can be read, there is still accuracy of careful language, thought-out logic, and other phases of the paper."

"Rhetorical accuracy, you mean?"

"I'm not sure I know what you mean by rhetorical accuracy."

"You've admitted that on the technical divisions of the paper you rely on the printed record. That leaves the form, the logic, the sentence structure, choice of words. Those are phases of rhetorical accuracy as I see it."

"If that's what you mean, I'll agree."

"Good. Would you say this rhetorical accuracy made a speech?"

"No, I don't believe the reading of a paper makes a speech."

"But even if a person spoke from memory, having all these qualities, would it still be a speech?"

I remembered that this man had claimed to have read the authorities in our field.

"No, it would still not necessarily be a speech."

"But still you claim there is something in the reading of a paper, which is not a speech though you are having a speech convention, which you can get in printed form afterwards, which is not better prepared than the extempore speech should be if the speaker is honest—I say there is still something in the reading of these papers that makes your conventions worth while?"

"We think of the personality of the man, the inspiration of his voice, the power of his conviction, which comes out to us even over the reading of the typewritten material." Again I had spoken hastily, realizing it as the words echoed back. But the stranger was kind. He took little notice.

"You say that it's the personality, inspiration, the power of the man that's really important. That's why you have conventions primarily?"

"Yes." There was nothing else to say!

"When a person gives a speech, and is successful, would you not say that the speech was successful because of the personality, the inspiration, the power of the speaker?"

I remembered I had said that to one of my classes, in almost those words.

"That's true."

"Do you believe that a written paper gives the same inspiration, personality, power, presupposing the preparation is equal?"

"I don't know. A man reading can put as much into his voice—"

"Does he?"

A clarion question! As I thought back over my experience I could no longer dodge.

"No, he doesn't."

"Let us have one more point on accuracy. Didn't Professor Woolbert once say that the most successful speech was the one that met the needs of one particular audience at one particular time?"

"I believe he said something similar to that."

"Have you ever heard a paper changed because of an audience different than the reader had visualized?"

"I've heard them stop and comment."

"Do you believe they change the paper?"

"Rarely, if ever."

"Might it not be possible then, on this very point of accuracy that with the make-up of the group other than the writer had visualized the paper would really be inaccurate or a failure—inaccurate because of the very rhetorical accuracy you have been praising—inaccurate and failure because it did not meet the needs of the group to which it was presented?"

At last I thought I had this man confounded. He had narrowed the field. He had taken a stand. Now I would show him.

"In so doing he might depart from his original idea, which is the important thing."

"The original idea is? I thought you said you could read that in the JOURNAL. I thought you said the inspiration, the personality, the contact with the man was the important thing."

"But these are less important if the speaker does not present something worth while."

"Surely you do not want me to believe that teachers of speech would start a speech and get so far off the subject, the idea, as to give something unworthy?"

I guess I didn't have him.

"My friend, let us sum up. Accuracy being our first consideration, we find two kinds, technical and rhetorical. The technical we need to study. This can be done at leisure and most satisfactorily from the printed page. The rhetorical we find may lead to definite inaccuracy in terms of that great interest of your convention—inspiration. That inspiration demands the meeting of minds. There must

be something of exchange even in the presentation of material where one person does all the talking. This is necessary if one is to really see the personality, power, and inspiration of the speaker at its best. We have also seen that adequate preparation is not guaranteed by the reading of a paper, on the contrary the reading may be an admission that the person hasn't been willing to spend the time necessary to present an acceptable extempore speech. Also, a minor point, the reading of papers has not corrected the fault of running over time. Is there anything more to say?"

During this summary my mind had been working as rapidly as I could force the cumbersome wheels to work. I tried to think of the arguments of others in our profession who upheld the practice of reading papers. None of the arguments seemed to meet the logic of this summary. But something needed saying.

"Frankly, you implied that this was a matter of specialists talking to specialists. We just don't give weight to—" my mind was working rapidly—what did I want to say?—"We don't feel that extempore work demands respect."

I wished immediately that I hadn't said it. I was desperate. Here a complex of mine had cropped out. I find in myself that lack of respect for the opinions of others, whether with or without a paper. I often had wondered as I saw men walking around in the halls as the sessions were going on, if they too thought they were above the opinions of others. My friend was kind.

"You mean that speaking really doesn't count for very much because you know so much about it already?"

"Please, let's forget it was said. I wish to thank you for many ideas. Now I think the next session is about to begin."

"There is just one more thing. I do wish to compliment someone, I suppose your president. I did hear one real speech, virile, challenging, personal, direct, inspirational, powerful. It was delivered by this gentleman," pointing to the program. "Is he your president?"

I looked. As in sort of a daze I found he was pointing to the name of a guest speaker, one not connected with the profession at all.

I was not Socrates. I even wondered if speech were speech.

JOSEPH BACCUS, *University of Redlands*

SUSTAINING MEMBERSHIP

The 1930 Chicago Convention amended the Constitution of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION to provide for sustaining membership with dues of ten dollars per year instead of the regular two dollars and a half. In adopting this plan our organization followed the practice of many other academic societies. We are always hard pressed for funds to sustain the constantly growing program of the ASSOCIATION. At the present time the following are sustaining members:

C. C. Arends
Elmhurst College
Elmhurst, Illinois

Maud May Babcock
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah

Mrs. Mabel Balensiefer
1235 Holman Rd.
Oakland, California

Sara M. Barber
110 New York Ave.
Brooklyn, N. Y.

L. E. Bassett
Stanford University
Palo Alto, California

J. Richard Bietry
Los Angeles Junior College
Los Angeles, California

Dr. C. S. Bluemel
Physician
Denver, Colorado

W. Norwood Brigance
Wabash College
Crawfordsville, Indiana

John Mark Brophy
174 Westminster Drive
Yonkers, New York

Donald C. Bryant
New York College for Teachers
Albany, New York

Mrs. Marie B. Bryant
Jamaica Training School
Jamaica, New York

Rupert Cortright
College of the City of Detroit
Detroit, Michigan

Mary E. Cramer
434 West 120th St.
New York City

C. C. Cunningham
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

Ralph Dennis
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

G. E. Densmore
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

John Dolman, Jr.
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

A. M. Drummond
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

The Forensic Council
% John Frizzell
210 Highland Ave.
State College, Pennsylvania

W. C. Garwick
Fairchild Aerial Camera Corporation
New York City

Wilbur E. Gilman
127 Glen Avenue
Amsterdam, New York

Guy S. Greene
Iowa State College
Ames, Iowa

Violet Hassler
The Stout Institute
Menomonie, Wisconsin

Dorothea A. Hubschmitt
125 West 122 St.
New York City

Hoyt Hudson
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey

Lee Hultzen
Dartmouth College
Hanover, New Hampshire

Mrs. Sarah Mary Wilson Huntley
Bay Ridge High School
Brooklyn, N. Y.

R. K. Immel
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California

Lou Kennedy
Hotel St. George
Brooklyn, New York

S. L. Kennedy
Warners, New York

James Lardner
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

Azubah Latham
535 W. 113th St.
New York City

Charles Layton
Muskingum College
New Concord, Ohio

Eleanor McLellan
33 West 67th St.
New York City

Frederick McKay
Ypsilanti State Teachers College
Ypsilanti, Michigan

Edward C. Mabie
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Phyllis Logan Moorhead
109 West 45th St.
New York City

Elizabeth Morse
Morse School of Expression
St. Louis, Missouri

Henry M. Moser
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Dorothy I. Mulgrave
New York University
New York City

T. Earl Pardoe
66 E. 3rd., North
Provo, Utah

G. R. R. Pflaum
Emporia State Teachers College
Emporia, Kansas

Henrietta Prentiss
Hunter College
New York City

F. M. Rarig
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Floyd K. Riley
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Paul J. Ritter
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California

J. P. Ryan
Grinnell College
Grinnell, Iowa

Preston H. Scott
College of the City of Detroit
Detroit, Michigan

Medeleine M. Sevenans
Beverly Hills School District
Beverly Hills, California

Clarence T. Simon
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

Jane Bliss Taylor
Hunter College
New York City

S. Elizabeth Tyson
State Teachers College
West Chester, Pennsylvania

Dwight E. Watkins
Wheeler Hill
Berkeley, California

A. T. Weaver
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

J. Dale Welsch
Elkader Junior College
Elkader, Iowa

H. A. Wichelns (two memberships)
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

Arleigh B. Williamson
New York University
New York City

J. A. Winans
Dartmouth College
Hanover, New Hampshire

H. S. Woodward
Western Reserve University
Cleveland, Ohio

Dorothy Yawger
54 Young Ave.
Pelham, New York

Alfred Young
712 Putnam Avenue
Brooklyn, New York

Pauline Zoller
219 S. Second St.
Grand Haven, Michigan

NEW BOOKS

Reading Aloud, by WAYLAND MAXFIELD PARRISH. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1932; pp. 401.

The opportunity to use a book in class for a semester before reviewing it is at least rare. This experience with Parrish's book has convinced me that it is probably the best textbook available for an elementary course in interpretation. A textbook on reading should, it seems to me, provide sound principles of rhetoric, reading material of literary excellence, and a graded arrangement of principles and practice material. In other words, such a book, to be most useful, should be neither a treatise on public speaking nor an anthology, but a judicious combination of both, and *Reading Aloud* achieves this balance.

The rhetorical principles are as old as Aristotle, though they are here presented chiefly in the forms given them by Whately and the English rhetoricians, and by Hiram Corson. Thus Parrish accepts the "natural method," the method based on the idea that the best way to interpret a piece of prose or verse is to assimilate, so far as possible, its author's intent as to logical content, imagery, emotion, attitude, and literary form. Successive chapters of *Reading Aloud* introduce the student to the analysis of these elements. Each chapter is followed by selections carefully chosen to illustrate the element under consideration, and by a cumulative list of questions designed to aid the student in testing the progress of his analysis. The chapters on rhythm are especially illuminating. It is a truism that there can be no good reading of verse without a sensitive feeling for rhythm, but in our revolt from the mechanical methods of the older elocutionists we have perhaps neglected this aspect of the problem, and few of us have given sufficient attention to the rhythm of prose.

The selections for practice, which range from Plato and Theophrastus through Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth, Shelley, Keats, Browning, and Tennyson to Walter De la Mare, G. K. Chesterton, Ezra Pound, Walter Lippmann, and Edwin Arlington Robinson, are

uniformly excellent. There are unusually well unified selections from "Paradise Lost." On the other hand, it is to be regretted that few contemporary poets are included; it is quite probable, of course, that copyright difficulties are the explanation. Unfortunately, too, the proofreading of these selections has not been accurate; there are, for instance, several errors in the text of Browning's "Up at a Villa—Down in the City," and enough scattered errors in other selections to make verification a matter of some urgency to the user.

Two chapters dealing with voice and pronunciation are perhaps of doubtful utility; they are useful in calling attention to the problem, but hardly of sufficient development to do much good. It is too bad that Parrish chose to develop his chapter on pronunciation by means of the Websterian diacritical marks instead of the phonetic alphabet, since linguistic students have discarded the Webster symbols as awkward and inaccurate. The phonetic alphabet has, to be sure, its inconsistencies, but it is gradually being brought to uniformity. Most of the inconsistencies that Parrish finds are, moreover, the result of differences either between British and American pronunciation, or between broad and narrow transcription, that is, between a transcription that makes only important distinctions and one which aims to give finer shades as well.

This, however, is a minor point, and the positive virtues of the book make it seem very minor indeed. The only real fault is the proofreading, and that can doubtless be remedied in the next edition. As a final recommendation for *Reading Aloud*, the students like it.

C. K. THOMAS, *Cornell University*

A Theatre Library. By ROSAMOND GILDER. (A publication of the National Theatre Conference.) New York: Theatre Arts, 1932; pp. xiv, 74; $1.

Anyone with an interest in the historical, critical, and descriptive literature of the theatre will be delighted to thumb through the pages of Miss Gilder's ably compiled bibliography of one hundred selected books. In her fourteen-page introduction the author outlines the scope and purpose of her booklist:

> The increasing interest in books on the theatre, and the increasing need of forming practical libraries for students and workers has led to the compilation of the following bibliography of a hundred modern books on the theatre. It

aims primarily at providing an actual buying list of books available in English for the librarian, teacher and book lover, but it has also been arranged in such a way as to form a reading guide for those who are studying the history of the stage.

The titles chosen by Miss Gilder are chiefly those related to the development of the theatre, past and present. The books are numbered and are arranged chronologically and by countries. The selection being made with a view to comprehensiveness and concentration, those works that contain the most recent and complete statement on the subject are given preference over the more classic studies. "These are, obviously, not source books for research, but the authoritative pronouncements of scholars who have brought together material from public records and private archive for the instruction of the student and the delectation of the amateur."

Each of the titles included in Miss Gilder's list is briefly but efficiently described, one to three titles appearing on a page. Comments are provided and comparisons are noted between one book and another. Much useful territory is encompassed here in remarkably few words. Although the author has limited himself to the one hundred works which she feels will most effectively tell the story of the theatre, she does not hesitate to mention the titles of many other books containing similar or supplementary material. *A Theatre Library* is in actuality, therefore, a bibliography concerning some three hundred or more works of reference, so arranged and presented to the reader as to direct his major attention to an even five-score of the more "important," or generally useful, books.

With all the information supplied by the seventy-four-page guide in hand, however, one finds, as the reader can readily guess, that there are large tracts of dramatic history which remain untouched. The written record of the theatre as a whole is clearly still far from complete. If one were to possess every book mentioned between the covers of this bibliography there would yet appear on the shelves devoted to the story of the world's stages several distressing gaps. Of this drawback Miss Gilder is, of course, aware; the existence of these blank spaces is not due to the absence of zeal in the bibliographer but to the presence of sterile stretches in the written records themselves. "The barren spaces," as the author comments, "are interesting indications of the comparatively short time that the theatre history has been studied with interest in the English-speaking countries."

This period of general, or comprehensive research, can be set within the limits of an active but very brief twenty years. As a result, the Oriental theatre is still quite poorly represented, except in popular, rather superficial works; no authoritative writings covering the entire story of the French or German stage are available in English; the Italian and Spanish stages remain partially obscure; and there are large areas even in the records of the British and American theatres which still lie pretty much in the dark. To someone of a scholarly turn of mind this book will come as a challenge as well as a list of suggestions for acquisition.

Although the best part of Miss Gilder's guide is devoted to works dealing with the history of the stage, there is one short division near the end of the bibliography in which an attempt has been made to list a few modern books on theory and practice. The field represented here is, of course, an extremely difficult one in which to make a truly unbiassed and scholarly selection. Miss Gilder chooses to set down only nine major works—mentioning a few lesser ones in her notes. I am myself inclined to believe that the author, if she had been willing to spend a little more thought on this department of her guide, might have been able to persuade herself to add a few more names to her favored list. It gives me a slight touch of unhappiness to observe the absence here of three or four of those titles which I especially esteem.

My disappointment is alleviated somewhat when, on turning the page, I behold the selection of textbooks and portfolios listed under the heading of "Pictorial Presentation." Eighteen important illustrated works covering scenery, lighting, and costume design are included in this section. This valuable type of publication is unfortunately commonly omitted in theatre bibliographies. Miss Gilder's final list will, I am sure, be an eminently useful one for the artist, the research student, and the librarian.

There are two limitations to the book-list which are imposed, not by circumstances, but by the author herself. One is that no plays are included, except those editions containing valuable notes, introductions, and special reference-material which cannot be found elsewhere. The other limitation is that all modern technical treatises on the various aspects of stagecraft are omitted. Every library used by a producing group needs, of course, more than anything else, a set of good manuals. However, Miss Gilder is probably justified in leaving

the "practical" type of book out of her present list. She has designed *A Theatre Library* to be something more than a temporary guide. It is a fact that with pathetically few exceptions the craftsmen's manuals published up to the present time in this country have lacked the character to establish for themselves any definite standards of permanent quality. New books in this field are being published every week. Those books which are being widely consulted in theatre shops today may all be entirely superseded by mature and more "authoritative" works within the short period of a few years, or even months. Theatre handbooks, in any case, are nearly always selected with a view to the immediate needs of the person or group involved. The lists from which such books can be chosen are both accessible and varied; so their inclusion here might be considered in some respects superfluous.

A ten-page index completes Miss Gilder's little book. *A Theatre Library* is a wisely planned and well executed bibliography. The author and the other persons concerned in the preparation of the book are to be congratulated. I know of no other guide to the literature of the stage which gives the reader such a full, clear, easy, and withal scholarly perspective of a vast study.

SAMUEL SELDEN, *University of North Carolina*

The Stage Is Set. By LEE SIMONSON. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1932; pp. 585; $5.

One of our foremost designers of stage scenery, goaded apparently by the stinging paradoxes of Mr. Gordon Craig, has been moved to examine the present state of the theatre in the light of its illustrious past. Mr. Simonson has marched confidently through theatrical history, that rough territory seldom disturbed except by the timid and laborious passage of the student, and emerging with the evidence of such authorities as Nicoll, Mantzius, Chambers, Haigh, Flickinger, Bapst, Cohen, Decharme, Campbell, Lawrence etc., he proceeds to shatter the aura of ideal beauty with which Mr. Craig has invested the theatres of Greece, the Middle Ages, and Elizabethan England, proving that if theatrical production has ever been greater than it is today, it was not for want of elaborate and ingenious scenery, and if at times it was less elaborate and less realistic, it was not for want of the desire both for spectacle and for realism.

Having thus shown that salvation for the theatre does not lie in a return to the past (something Mr. Craig in his paradoxical fashion has more than once remarked), Mr. Simonson turns his whole attention to that most articulate of the prophets of a new art of the theatre. A practical and regular worker in the existent theatre, Mr. Simonson shows a natural irritation at the armchair "vaporings" of Ellen Terry's obstreperous son. He devotes considerable space not only to damning Craig's writings and designs as visionary and contradictory (easily done, if one ignores half of what he has written), but also to proving that Craig is a decadent romantic ridden by the neurotic "father-image," not, strange to say, of Craig's own father, but of Henry Irving.

This is all very well. Craig is self-contradictory. His writings reveal not an ordered scheme for theatrical reform, but only a general feeling about the nature of theatrical art and three or four very definite quarrels with the modern theatre. Oddly enough, Mr. Simonson diagnoses the ills of this same modern theatre and finds first, an unsound financial basis, second, a dearth of living poetry! For twenty or more years Mr. Craig has been "bawling," as he himself so aptly describes it, about the same ills. If Part IV of *The Stage is Set* seems on first glance to bear little resemblance to sections expressing the same ideas in *On the Art of the Theatre* and *The Theatre Advancing*, it is possibly because the latter show more of that power and richness of expression, the lack of which in modern plays Mr. Simonson so loudly bewails.

This is not to say that *The Stage Is Set* is without merit. On the contrary, it is probably the best and certainly the most interesting book on the theatre that has been written in this country. The historical survey is most stimulating, and Mr. Simonson has done a real service in dispelling the obscurity that has long surrounded the activities of Adolphe Appia and the Duke of Saxe-Meiningen and pointing out their tremendous influence on the modern theatre.

BARNARD W. HEWITT, *University of Montana*

Correction of Defective Speech. By E. B. TWITMYER and Y. S. NATHANSON. Philadelphia: P. Blakiston's Son & Co., Inc., 1932; pp. 413.

Here is the latest extensive bibliopolistic venture in the field of the pathology of speech and the correction of its disorders. The book

begins with the most eloquent foreword that I have ever read as an introduction to a purely professional and technical publication. The authors herein not only delimit their field and view it from a lofty perspective, but also color and outline the details of the field so that they stand out sharply for the reader:

> The whole cosmic scheme of life is applicable to its isolated processes. Speech output—verbal end-result of thought, differential of man and beast, index of genius or fool, characteristic of philosopher or maniac,—is one of these isolated processes. . . . *Our attack cannot be successfully waged against an uncontrolled environment; therefore our attack upon the problem must concentrate itself upon the development of the individual.* This philosophic and pragmatic concept has been the basis for our development of the *psycho-physiological* approach to the diagnosis and correction of the defects of speech,—to our recognition of a *minoris locus resistentiae*, an aspect of the *residual diathesis*.

The foreword is indeed a fine piece of writing and shows that the authors mean to build the structure of their book upon a broad and deep foundation of scholarship. The book intends to include not merely a compilation of recipes but a statement of the rationale of such recipes.

The major part of the book (334 out of 413 pages) is devoted to corrective material and technique. The authors have here included long lists of words and sentences incorporating the sounds upon which the child defective in speech is to be drilled. The authors did not construct these exercises in haphazard fashion, taking each sound and choosing words in which the sound is used without reference to the practical value to the child of the words employed. The authors have chosen 5,012 words that appear most commonly in our language. "In computing frequencies and determining classification," they write, "each frequency word was analyzed. . . . The purpose of this is apparent. It permits of an analysis of the actual sound frequency properly weighted." Apparently the authors intend not only to give each defective word in the child's vocabulary an amount of drill commensurate with its frequency of use by him, but also to give each defective sound unit as much attention in drill as its frequency in our language would warrant. They include the table of sound frequencies upon which their exercises are built, beginning with (R) at 2,149 occurrences out of 16,666 for all other sounds, and ending with 173 occurrences of (CH) out of the same total.

The authors list the sounds that they have thus analyzed in the following pages: xvii, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19. The lists are identical.

These lists omit many consonant sounds, among them the (NG) as in *sing;* (ZH) as in vision, azure, Asia; (Y) as in young, st(*y*)udent, yet; and its voiceless equivalent, as the initial sound in humorous, human, huge. Do the authors mean by the omission of these sounds that they are so infrequent in our language as to need no attention, or that these sounds are seldom defective?

Under the head of "The Continuants" the authors include only five vowels: (E) as in meet, (AH) as in far, (OO) as in moon, (O) as in home, and (I) as in mite. The last two sounds are diphthongs. Do the authors mean to say that there are in English only three pure vowels and two diphthongs? They have omitted at least three diphthongs and five vowels, including such infrequent (?) sounds as (A) as in cat, and (OI) as in boy, and (OW) as in cow. (The reader of this review may wonder why I am using this clumsy spelling method of representation of sounds rather than that of the phonetic symbols. I am using the system of sound-representation employed by the authors, because there is no way of being sure just what phonetic symbol to use for each of the spellings that they use.)

At the beginning of each section of exercises the sound to be practised on is described. Many of these descriptions are so vague as to be of no benefit, and in some instances they are misleading. There are many mistakes in the phonetic basis for the practical exercises included in this book. In the discussion of (T), (D), and (N) no mention is made as to which are voiced sounds, while in the analogous relationship among the sounds (P), (B), and (M), (M) is described as possessing "laryngeal vibration" and (B) is said to be the same as (P) "with the exception that the compression is less and there is grosser approximation of the lips," with no mention of the sonant feature of (B). For (N) "the breath is permitted to escape evenly between the oral and nasal passages," the authors state. With the back plosives (K) and (G) the authors mention that the latter is sonant, but omit to make any mention at all of (NG) that is related to (G) in the same way that (N) is related to (D) and (M) is related to (B). In discussing the (TH) sounds the authors make no distinctions between the voiced and voiceless sounds, etc. etc. The authors seem to be naive amateurs in the realm of speech sounds.

Since the major contribution of this book is the practical exercises, it leaves the reviewer very little opportunity for commendation.

All we can say is that if the teacher knows his phonetics, he will find the word lists helpful; but if he does not know his phonetics, the exercises will be misleading.

ROBERT WEST, *University of Wisconsin*

The Year Book of College Oratory, Volume IV. Compiled by EVAN A. ANDERSON. New York: Noble and Noble, 1932; pp. 378; $2.

The three preceding year books of college oratory were restricted to a selected number of winning orations. This volume marks a departure and improvement wherein the scope is broadened to become "one hundred per cent representative of the oratorical associations of the country." It includes the winning orations of all intercollegiate contests—at least all known to this reviewer—excepting the Northern Oratorical League and the Kentucky State Oratorical Association. It is by far the most comprehensive volume of its kind issued from the American press. In it appear nineteen orations of 1932 that won state contests, nine that won regional or sectional contests, and four that won national contests. In addition, five miscellaneous orations are included, some that placed second in state contests and some that won purely local contests. To this reviewer the latter group seem entirely out of place, not that they suffer by comparison in merit, but that they violate the purpose implied both in the title and the preface. These miscellaneous orations, however, are too few seriously to impair the main objective of the volume.

Inevitably the reader upon opening this volume will ask himself: What of the quality in thought and language of these orations, products of American college youth? College orations, on this score, long have been under fire. So far back as 1884 a critical college senior described a state oratorical contest in these words: "The spread-eagle style was very noticeable in all the speeches. . . . These are the kind that have been accustomed to win. . . . Year after year we get a rehash of the same old ideas. The skeleton of these orations is about as follows: First, the great American Republic . . . exhaustless resources, rich mines, fertile valleys. . . . Second, this is the home of the oppressed and downtrodden of every land. . . . Then they come in on home stretch with a brilliant description and a glowing anticipation of the future. . . . They fill it out to suit the imagination."

But should this discerning critic of forty-nine years ago read this *Oratorical Year Book* of 1932, we feel that he must certainly be forced to waive his major criticism. In it to be sure are occasional immaturities of thought—we have heard that in the United States Senate; we would hardly expect to escape it entirely among college youth. But the spread-eagle type seems to have departed. Instead these young speakers are aiming straight from the shoulder at real problems in American life, as the following excerpts indicate: "Perhaps one day the headlines will read—instead of 'Congress Refuses Federal Relief to the Unemployed,' 'Jim Watson Shot Down on Way to White House.' "—"This crisis calls for men."—"Go forth, with the ballot for your sword."

Strip off the names and titles of these orations; separate them from all association with college contests; lay them alongside the productions from the pulpit, legislative chambers, business conventions, and public halls; have them compared by unsuspecting readers, unaware of their origin—and they certainly would not stand at the bottom.

With reason has Editor Anderson written in the preface:

> The 1932 college orator has given us straight thinking and plain speaking. With convictions based on the findings of careful research . . . . [he] has presented his message without fanfare or flourish . . . . With pitiless acerbity he has hurled his scathing arraignments into 'places high and places low.' Implacable as he has been in his sweeping criticisms . . . . he has refused to share in the opinion that civilization is moving . . . . straight to certain destruction. He has, rather, taken the view . . . . that the present sufferings are but the pangs of a bitter travail, from which, under the guidance of sound leadership, a new and better order shall evolve. Whether we agree or disagree with him, we are impelled to admit that . . . . he has exhibited sound statesmanship.

With reason also has Editor Anderson added, "He has . . . done credit to that department of collegiate training that he has represented."

WILLIAM NORWOOD BRIGANCE, *Wabash College*

Intercollegiate Debates, Vol. XIII, Edited by EGBERT RAY NICHOLS. New York: Noble and Noble, 1932; pp. x, 466; $2.

For a cross-section of the debates of the year, the current volume of *Intercollegiate Debates* offers discussions of nine widely-used

topics. The series as a whole represents the various sections of the country, the leading institutions in debate, the favorite propositions, and the common types of presentation. In this volume the debates vary widely. Some have whole speeches on such subjects as capitalism without any substantiated statements, while others bristle with statistics and quotations. Some stick to the issues with some hope of finding the truth, while one or two are quibbles rather than debates, and offer an excellent opportunity for study of "tactics."

One Oregon type debate is the only variation from standard presentation, but the growing popularity of the radio debate is recognized, four out of nine discussions being of that type. The "Honorable Judges" have at last disappeared from the salutation and may now consider themselves fit to be included among the "Ladies and Gentlemen." That the approach to debate varies greatly is shown by the introductions of two adjacent affirmative speeches. In a transcontinental radio discussion with Leland Stanford, the first Harvard speaker, in advocating a stronger central government for the United States, began as follows:

> One hundred and forty years ago, when our Federal government was established, it took a rumbling stage-coach three days and a half to come to Boston from the little town of Northampton. Wednesday the Leland Stanford football team arrived in Boston after three days enroute from California. Tomorrow they play Dartmouth in the Harvard Stadium. Just an hour ago some spectators left California by airplane for a twenty-four hour journey to Boston to witness the game.
>
> But at this moment distance is being annihilated even more dramatically. Within a split second after these words are uttered, our friends in California will hear them distinctly. So will you people in New Orleans, Denver, and Chicago. In fact, for practical purposes, the whole nation is gathered together in this room!
>
> And so, we are doubly glad to participate in this broadcast—first, because our opponents represent a great West Coast University;—second, because the fact that such a broadcast is possible illustrates graphically that for governmental and economic purposes our vast American continent has shrunk during the past one hundred years until in communication and transportation hours it is no larger than the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, alone, in 1789.
>
> No longer are we thirteen independent colonies nor forty-eight separate states—but we are one nation. Our friends in California wear the same clothes, eat the same foods, read the same literature, see the same movies and listen to the same broadcasts as we. Economically, socially, culturally, we are one—but politically we are subject to forty-nine contradictory governments! As a result of this disorder, our political institutions are powerless to cope with the

multitude of problems which fusion has created. There is but one remedy; we must strengthen our central government. . . .

Another debate is begun thus:

I speak for Denison Affirmative on the question, "*Resolved*: that Capitalism as a system of economic organization is unsound." We firmly believe that Capitalism is unsound and in substantiating our belief I will outline briefly the case against Capitalism which includes, unequal distribution of wealth, tremendous over-production in industry, private monopoly of basic industries and natural resources; each of which is sufficiently important to justify our releasing ourselves from this great menace Capitalism. Mr. Klein will continue the argument by explaining what true Socialism will do and by presenting our plan of Socialism. Mr. Kruse will conclude our argument with a comparison of the future under Capitalism and under Socialism.

What a serious group these debaters are! "Cancellation of War Debts," "Capitalism," "Stronger Central Government," "Centralized Control of Industry," "Retardation of Business Recovery by Wage Reductions," "Price Fixing of Staple Agricultural Products," "Old Age Pensions," "Unemployment Insurance,"—only the last proposition in the list, "Divorce as a Social Asset," breaks through the clouds of economic depression. Here only do the debaters venture a mild jest or two. Debating is still serious business if we may judge by these speeches. Also, there has been little development in adaptation to audience. Twenty years ago the editor in an early volume of the series remarked, "As a rule, a debater does not plead his case, he states it. His end is conviction, not persuasion." In this volume, the attitude of the debater toward his audience is still like that of the famous railroad magnate toward the public!

This neglect of the audience-situation is probably the fault of the selection, rather than of the modern debater. Three of the debates in this volume are synthetic, merely the brushing up of threadbare cases after a season of extensive debate. In one "debate" a two-man team, after debating both sides of a question more than forty times, debates itself and meets its own arguments skilfully! (What an opportunity for those who claim debating needs more student participation and sincerity of conviction!) Actual debates, stenographically reported, not completely revised, would offer better material for the study of debating as it exists today.

Otherwise, the book is well edited. The reappearance of the list of debate coaches and their institutions will be hailed with glee by

debate directors, managers, and questionnaire fiends. In spite of the synthetic debates, lack of humor, and lack of audience consideration, the discussions show clear thinking, interest in the major problems of the day, facility of expression and command of debate technique. We still have more to hope than fear from debate.

BROOKS QUIMBY, *Bates College*

Straight and Crooked Thinking. By ROBERT H. THOULESS. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1932; pp. 261.

In this little book of 261 pages written by the head of the psychological department of Glasgow University lies a wealth of suggestion for anyone interested in the methods by which speakers and writers influence the thinking processes of their audiences. This is not a textbook on logic. It is more interestingly written than any discussion of formal logic I have ever seen. It is, as the title suggests, a discussion of the various forms of unsound thinking as they often occur in oral and written discourse.

The book is based on the premise that the controversial questions of the present day can be solved only through sound thinking. Most of the illustrations are taken from controversial questions with which the reader is acquainted. This gives the book a practical application not always found in discussions of reasoning. The author treats in detail various forms of unsound reasoning and "tricks in argument," which, used consciously or unconsciously by those arguing, tend to confuse the reader or hearer. His idea is that a knowledge of these types of crooked thinking will enable the individual to detect their use and to be on his guard against them. The book goes much further than the usual discussion of fallacies. Many of the forms of loose thinking to which the author calls attention are so subtle that they may never be noticed by the average hearer or reader unless he is acquainted with the particular fault and is on his guard against it. The fact that most people are not able quickly to analyze arguments as they are presented is, of course, what makes much of the propaganda we hear so detrimental to clear thinking. The hearer is misled without being aware that his thought is being influenced dishonestly or that there is anything at all wrong with the argument.

In addition to pointing out types of loose thinking used in discourse Professor Thouless also calls attention to obstacles in our own

minds which may make us unwilling or unable to think straight on a given subject. He feels that if we are aware of these obstacles and the manner in which they may be exploited by an unscrupulous propagandist, we can better protect ourselves against such exploitation.

There is much in this book that is particularly suggestive to the teacher and student of argument and persuasion. In the short space of a review there can be only brief mention of a few important ideas. The first chapter is devoted to a discussion of the use of emotionally toned words—words which indicate the emotional attitude of the speaker toward an idea and tend to arouse an emotional attitude in the hearer—as one form of crooked thinking. It is the idea of the author that problems such as tariffs, prohibition, and social ownership demand rational solutions and that emotional thinking has no place in the discussions centering about them. Is there not a dilemma here for teachers of speech? What Professor Thouless says about the effect of emotional words in obscuring thought often holds true; but if speeches on public questions be divested of all emotionally toned words, what will then be left?

Several of the ideas developed in this book may well cause us as teachers of public speaking to ask ourselves some searching questions as to our part in developing habits of straight thinking. (I take it that the encouragement of straight thinking is part of our job.) Many of our textbooks emphasize such devices as repeated affirmation, rendering an audience suggestible, beginning with easily accepted statements so that the audience will be more likely to accept a doubtful one, the appeal to habits of thought and the appeal to personal interests as valuable in producing conviction and securing action. Yet it is precisely because they have this effect of producing conviction without thought that Professor Thouless condemns them as tricks of argument and as productive of crooked thinking. I think, however, that most of us will agree that there is a legitimate use of these devices which is not unfair to the hearer.

In discussing what he calls "tricks of suggestion" Professor Thouless mentions "repeated affirmation," "a confident, insistent method of speaking," and "prestige." He does not condemn these in themselves but only when used for the purpose of gaining acceptance without argument. He calls attention to methods often used by speakers to build up their own prestige. He thinks that "we should be in-

clined to distrust all suggestion by prestige and not merely that based on false credentials." However,

> After we have said all we can against the use of tricks of suggestion, it remains true that in public speaking some use of them is unavoidable. . . . Intellectual honesty makes, therefore, certain demands on a public speaker. He must never say in a public speech what he would not be prepared to maintain in private argument with none of the apparatus of suggestion at his command. He must not use confident affirmation as a substitute for argument in order to make his audience accept a doubtful proposition.

This is enough to convey an idea of the author's purpose and method. In addition to pointing out the tricks in argument he suggests methods by which they may be answered if used against one in a discussion. He appends at the close a list of thirty-four dishonest tricks in argument which furnishes an excellent summary for the preceding chapters.

As my contribution to the cause of straight thinking I urge the reading of this book.

CHARLES A. FRITZ, *New York University*

Preparing the Commencement Address. By F. W. LAMBERTSON. Cedar Falls, Iowa: College Print Shop, 1932; pp. 84.

In this neatly-mimeographed handbook Professor Lambertson has undertaken to achieve the following ends: "(1) to state the rhetorical principles applicable to the commencement address, (2) to discover the reactions of high school graduates to their commencement speakers, and (3) to present representative commencement addresses for study and analysis." Relying on both the results of a questionnaire sent out to high school graduates and on a body of speech theory with which he is thoroughly familiar, Professor Lambertson has prepared a volume which should prove of genuine interest and value to men and women who have occasion to deliver not only commencement speeches, but any sort of occasional addresses.

Approximately the first half of the book is devoted to the theory applicable to the commencement speech. The theory is the same that might be found in any good speech textbook; but the application of the theoretical material to the occasional address, and particularly to the commencement address, is reasonably direct. The problems associated with the selection of the subject, construction of the speech,

analysis of the audience, and delivery of the finished address are considered in some detail and in the manner of an approved technique.

Eleven commencement addresses by men influential in several fields of American life are printed in the second part of the book. The speech by Owen D. Young should be required reading for all students of public speaking, regardless of their interest or lack of interest in commencement orations.

LESTER W. THONSSEN, *College of the City of New York*

Man as Psychology Sees Him. By EDWARD S. ROBINSON. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1932; pp. 376; $2.50.

In an excellent chapter on "The Wares of Psychology," Professor Robinson makes it plain that psychology "is a science that deals largely with general conceptions of the probable truths of human nature. A science of that description certainly has a slippery sound, and it should have, because psychology is a slippery subject. There are some who feel that this uncomfortable condition would be overcome if only the professors would get down to business. There are others, and they are right, who realize that it is the fundamental nature of human nature, as it is of most other biological and social phenomena, to be intricate and variable. Under such circumstances the rational policy is to cultivate a toleration of the kind of uncertainty which such phenomena possess. It does no good to frown and stamp one's foot at nature."

To me the title of the book and the publisher's blurb gave the impression that this was a popularly written book giving the w.k. tired business man the "low-down" on acquiring a winning personality, selling stock and bonds, becoming a great orator, etc. The reading of the book showed my impression to be wrong.

The book discusses such subjects as motives, heredity and environment, learning, thinking, reasoning, mind, and soul. The author's usual method of treatment of these subjects is to trace the various attitudes toward them which have been held in the past and which are now being held by various psychologists and schools of psychologists. For an academic who has constantly to keep in mind what fellow academics will say about his writings, Professor Robinson has written interestingly.

The book should be helpful for a student who has just completed a beginning course in psychology and is considering the possibility of following academic psychology as his profession. The book will prove helpful also to speech teachers (and other human beings, likewise!) in showing the present state of affairs among academic psychologists.

HOWARD H. HIGGINS, *Miami University*

A Method of Lighting the Stage. By STANLEY R. MCCANDLESS. New York: Theatre Arts Inc., 1932; pp. 132; $1.50.

The Little Theatre world for some years has wanted two things which have just appeared in a single unit, a clear and concise discussion of a thoroughly practicable method of lighting the stage and an expression in book form of the ideas and methods of the recognized American authority on stage lighting, Professor Stanley R. McCandless of Yale University. In this monograph Professor McCandless reverses the usual method of presenting the subject, that of discussing all the instruments and equipment and then explaining how to use them; he presents first, as it should be presented, an analysis of the effect to be produced in light and continues logically with descriptions of the instruments best suited to the results intended.

He thoroughly analyzes light plots and instrument layouts and points out the superiority of individually controlled spotlights to footlights and borderlights for illuminating the acting area. Blending, tonal lighting, and background lighting are adequately explained, and his final chapter deals with creating the illusion of sunlight, moonlight, firelight, etc., and the use of Linnebach and lens projections. The book is well illustrated with many line drawings and a few halftones.

No other book on stage lighting so clearly, completely, and authoritatively presents an excellent method of lighting the stage. Since the price is so low, anyone can afford a copy and certainly no Little Theatre director, designer, or technician can afford to be without a copy at any price. Those in the professional theatre, also, should learn much from this volume.

H. D. SELLMAN, *University of Iowa*

CONTEMPORARY SPEECHES

(Speeches reviewed in this department are available in full text either in newspapers of approximately the dates of delivery or from special sources as mentioned. Correspondence concerning the department should be addressed to V. E. Simrell, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.)

THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

The speeches of the three leading candidates have one general characteristic, forced by the situation, the effort to dramatize economic issues. *Of Thee I Sing* defines an issue as "something that everybody is interested in, and that doesn't matter a damn." But Mr. Hoover, Mr. Roosevelt, and Mr. Thomas all made persistent and often admirably skilful attempts to interest everybody in things that do matter, and not only in their broad outlines and simplest aspects either but frequently in the complex and abstruse details that political audiences are apt to prefer to have skipped.

One-topic speeches were the rule. With the limitations of radio time and of the endurance of contemporary audiences it was difficult enough to discuss adequately such a subject as agriculture or public utilities in one speech, without attempting other topics. Even more than in 1928 this method of debate on the instalment plan was characteristic of the campaign. It reduced somewhat the repetition which makes every campaign tend to grow tiresome just when it should grow climatic. Yet the speeches were still too long for the radio audience, according to the letters reported from the broadcasting studios.

Whatever effect the speeches of the campaign may have had on the candidates' chances of success, it is fairly easy to observe the effect that their chances of success had on their speeches. Of course the situation gave Mr. Roosevelt the attack and Mr. Hoover the defense but their speeches emphasized the difference in their positions. Ogden Mills, for example, though actually as much on the defensive as Mr. Hoover, made speeches that sounded triumphantly aggressive. Mr. Hoover, even at the climax of his counter-attack, could not escape a tone of desperation, perhaps most strikingly illustrated by his lapse

into a correct subjunctive when he said, "I myself am taking heart over this debate. If it *could* be continued long enough I can drive him from every solitary position he has taken." Mr. Roosevelt, by contrast, maintained a confident manner that probably seemed to unfriendly critics altogether too jaunty. Of the three candidates only Norman Thomas showed an emotional poise seemingly unaffected by hopes or fears of election day.

Without any rash attempt to measure their effectiveness in the campaign the following speeches might be selected as of special rhetorical interest.

ROOSEVELT at Chicago, July 2, and HOOVER at Washington, August 11: The Speeches Accepting the Nominations

These, much more appropriately than the inflated orations of the conventions, might be called the keynote speeches. Mr. Roosevelt, exploiting all the dramatic value of his airplane trip to the convention, strikes the note of "bold leadership" but carefully modulates it with suggestions of common purpose and common counsel. Foolish traditions are to be broken, but the spirit of Woodrow Wilson is to guide; the problems of the time are to be solved by sure, consistent governmental policies, but the "first objective" of the candidate's campaign trips will be to learn from others the "conditions and needs" of the country. The tone of Mr. Hoover's speech is one of dogged resistance, expressed by frequent phrases like "I have insisted," "I am opposed," "I shall persist," and "We shall hold." Yet he magnifies the personal issue of the campaign until the whole burden is concentrated on himself. Even the so-called Stimson Doctrine becomes the doctrine "I have projected." In sharp contrast with this he remarks that he would "like to digress for one instant" to mention the greatest positive asset of the time, "the profound growth of the sense of social responsibility which this depression has demonstrated." Mr. Hoover almost violently discards the maxim that personal authority is stronger in attack and triumph than in defense.

ROOSEVELT at Topeka, September 14, and HOOVER at Des Moines, October 14

These two speeches, the chief utterances on the subject of agriculture, offer some interesting contrasts in rhetorical method. Both speakers begin by identifying themselves with the audience: Mr.

Roosevelt by a too obviously ingenious characterization of himself as a farmer, and Mr. Hoover by a natural and emotionally effective recollection of his boyhood in Iowa during the great depression of the seventies. From this personal identification with the audience both try to arrive at an identification of their interests with those of their audiences. And here, strangely, the initial advantage of Mr. Hoover's seems to me to pass to his opponent. Mr. Hoover transforms himself from an Iowa farm boy to a one-man government in Washington responsible for saving the gold standard and for keeping economic conditions from being worse. Even with a masterly exposition of what "going off the gold standard" means, especially to farmers, he seems to do less to establish the intended identification of interests than Mr. Roosevelt does with his plausible description of his plans, and his measures as governor, for making the condition of the farmers better. The lonely man in Washington struggling against "shocks from abroad" seems more alien than the man, though a New Yorker, who promises his support to the ideas of the farm leaders themselves.

Mr. Roosevelt's speech contains some very neat handling of statistics in concrete language. He does a better job of adapting his record as governor to the needs of campaign argument in the midwest than Mr. Smith did in 1928.

Mr. Hoover's speech, his first stump-speech of the campaign, takes a more aggressive tone than that of the acceptance speech but still he has difficulty in leaving his trenches. Military metaphors dominate his style; there are seventeen "battles" besides a large number of equivalents, varied, sometimes rather abruptly, by storms and earthquakes. His favorite contrast between "European shocks" and "the American system" is ingeniously developed to support his identification with the audience.

ROOSEVELT at Portland, September 21, and at San Francisco, September 23

Both of these speeches are distinctive for their lack of the characteristic vulgarities of stump oratory. The former, though dealing with the immediate issue of public utilities, shows a regard for structure and for propriety of style more to be expected in a formal address. The San Francisco speech varies from type similarly in method and also in subject. If, as Mr. Roosevelt said, he chose to discuss "The Philosophy of Government" because of the character of his

audience, the Commonwealth Club, it might be hoped that more campaign speeches might be made before such select and relatively homogeneous audiences and broadcast to the rest of the public who would prefer this sort of speech to the kind adapted to a party rally.

ROOSEVELT at Pittsburgh, October 19, and HOOVER at Detroit, October 22

What Walter Lippmann called "October Madness" was reaching its climax when these speeches were made. Mr. Roosevelt's, on federal finance and relief, shows his genius as a popular "interpreter" of statistics, and by contrast with the Portland and San Francisco speeches, his remarkable flexibility. The art of aggressive evasion is well illustrated by his statement on the bonus question. Mr. Hoover's, a direct reply, shows some of the same faculty with statistical evidence, but more strikingly it demonstrates by how much he is at his best in rebuttal.

HOOVER at Indianapolis, October 28

In the opinion of many commentators this was Mr. Hoover's best speech of the campaign. It is his most competently aggressive one, even though it is in this speech that there occurs the fateful subjunctive, "If this debate could be continued . . ." His exordium begins the fight with a standard device, an approach to susceptible members of the opposite party. He chooses probably the best possible topics for promoting Democratic desertions, namely the Democratic House of Representatives and an alleged analogy between this campaign and the campaigns of 1896 and 1928. From then on the speech is a rapid, slashing denunciation of "the new shuffle" and the Democratic campaign. The climax, I believe, overdoes the spectacular strategy of the speech. After being watched closely but in vain for an expected blunder, Mr. Roosevelt, on October 25th, had made an impromptu addition of the Supreme Court to his prepared statement of the branches of government controlled by the Republicans. Mr. Hoover seized the apparent opportunity, placed his attack on the alleged slander in the climactic position in his speech, but instead of using the incident as proof of a reckless, demagogic campaign, he interpreted it as a revelation of Mr. Roosevelt's own intent to reduce the Supreme Court to "an instrument of party policy." Mr. Hoover's peroration likewise suffers from overstatement. His assertion that the decision of the campaign would "fix the national direction for a hundred years

to come" brought effective ridicule from critics ranging from Will Rogers to Owen D. Young.

THOMAS at Columbus, Ohio, October 20, at New York, November 3 and by radio from Milwaukee, November 7

It means little to select certain speeches of Norman Thomas's for comment. The press reported so few of the more than 150 that he delivered that it is very difficult to select from the survivors.

Without benefit of frequent national hook-ups Mr. Thomas had to vary the practice of his opponents of dealing with a single topic in a speech. His Columbus speech is devoted to the proposal of a capital levy but usually he achieves unity by expounding the fundamental philosophy of socialism rather than by exhausting, *seriatim*, the specific topics of the campaign. Mr. Thomas has more rhetorical resources than either of his opponents but his speeches seem over-compressed and sometimes over-loaded with rhetorical devices. Frequently he conforms too literally to his assertion, "I have not come here simply to argue a case. . . . I have come here to enlist more of my countrymen in the great crusade for socialism in our time." A listener might easily feel at the end of the speech emotionally sympathetic but in a state of confusion that would make the emotion unstable.

In the Columbus speech Mr. Thomas demonstrates an interesting strategy in supporting his appeal for a capital levy by a persuasive exposition of just how it would work. Then having thus dealt with the usual anti-Socialist argument, "That's fine but how will you do it?" he avoids opposition to the details of his plan by assurance that they are tentative but the principle is sound. Details having rescued the principle, the principle reciprocates by rescuing the details.

In his speech in New York, made at a great Socialist rally in Madison Square Garden, he shows his greatest versatility. Local political scandals, the Roosevelt campaign, the Hoover campaign, the arguments of his capital levy speech and the arguments of his critics furnish his materials and he handles them with irony, with epithets, with slogans and epigrams, with authorities, statistics, arguments, and direct emotional appeals.

His last speech, broadcast the evening before Election Day was a direct appeal to voters to "vote your hopes and not your fears." It was hurried in delivery and too condensed for ready assimilation, but

it accomplishes eloquently the purpose of turning the tables on the defeatist argument that a Socialist vote is "thrown away."

OGDEN MILLS at Cincinnati, October 25, and at Brooklyn November 2

Reversing the situation of 1928, the Democrats had decidedly the better support from second-string orators collectively, but probably no one of them did as good work for the party as did Mr. Mills for the Republicans. In both of these speeches he shows his remarkable faculty for carrying the war to the enemy, in the former on economic issues and government finance, in the latter on the general conduct of the campaign and on prohibition. His rather contemptuous amiability toward his "good friend Franklin" might have more effect than Mr. Hoover's tone of grievance. His refutation of Democratic arguments excels that of his chief both in comprehensive sweep and in finality. In the Cincinnati speech he turns the tables on the Democratic charges that the Republicans are trying to frighten the nation into re-electing them. In the Brooklyn speech he uses the dry South as a back-fire against the Democrats' locally most popular topic of prohibition repeal. In this speech he runs through the list of the issues of the campaign with such facility that the speech by itself would make an adequate campaign textbook. His method of avoiding undue repetition in consecutive speeches is more a variation of emphasis and of strategy than of subject. Whereas Mr. Hoover and Mr. Roosevelt, as a rule, treat successive subjects with much the same technique, Mr. Mills usually takes the whole campaign as his subject but handles it differently each time.

NEWTON D. BAKER at Brooklyn, November 1

Mr. Baker, as might have been expected of him, made one of the most carefully restrained and most predominantly intellectual speeches of the campaign, dealing chiefly with international relations both economic and political. He uses the authority of his war-time office and an easy, almost casual, command of evidence.

CARTER GLASS, Radio address from Washington, November 1

Time chose Senator Glass's speech as the one most likely of all the campaign to seem valuable to future historians. Certainly its permanent value is not impaired by talking down to a popular audi-

ence for temporary advantage. With the knowledge of his experience in the Senate and the prestige of his conservative leadership, Mr. Glass tells the story of governmental policies through the economic crisis to show the unfairness of Mr. Hoover's theory of presidential leadership and a wild, recalcitrant Congress. The whole speech is a masterpiece of ethical persuasiveness and skill in narrative. As a radio address it is excellent support for the compliments that have been paid to radio's alleged influence on political oratory; and by its distinctiveness shows how premature those compliments have been.

OWEN D. YOUNG at New York, November 3

Two great arguments ran through most of the Republican campaign: that the Hoover administration had defended America against economic shocks from Europe that were responsible for the continued depression, and that economic catastrophe would follow a Democratic election. Mr. Young's speech, in fifteen minutes, is the perfect reply, in both tone and content, to both arguments. With liberality he criticizes the illiberal policy of American trade barriers against Europe, and with modesty he repudiates the immodest Hoover doctrine of indispensability. The simplicity and sharp pointedness of his style are the appropriate expression of his thought:

> I have no objection to a man saying that he would like to hold his job. I would do so, too. I have no objection to his presenting the reasons why he can do the job better than others. I would do so, too. But I resent at any time or at any place the attitude that the safety of this country depends on any man holding his job. No man has achieved that strength and this country has not deteriorated to that weakness.

Perhaps of as much interest to students of rhetoric as any of the campaign speeches themselves are some of Walter Lippmann's comments on them, the best rhetorical criticism of our time. Among his articles, which during the campaign appeared in well over a hundred newspapers, rhetorical studies are found in "Mr. Hoover at Des Moines," October 6, "October Madness," October 12, "On the Evasiveness of Candidates," October 13, "Governor Roosevelt on the Bonus and the Budget," October 21, "Dark Fears," November 1, "The Campaign of Fear," November 2, and "The Dregs of Debate," November 3.

V. E. SIMRELL, *Dartmouth College*

IN THE PERIODICALS

BROWN, FREDERICK W. *Stuttering: Its Neuro-Physiological Basis and Probable Causation.* American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, II, No. 4, October, 1932.

This very competent and well-documented article is another chapter in the long history of the effort to discover whether stuttering results from a conflict between the two hemispheres of the cerebral cortex, or between the cortex and some lower level, in this instance the optic thalamus. Its gist is to reject the former theory and to espouse the latter. It denies, or at least subordinates, the relevancy to the stuttering problem of the various sidedness phenomena as set forth by Travis and others; and it finds agreement as to the probable mutual transient nullification of each other by the inhibitory functions of the cortex and the emotional functions of the thalamus in the works of a number of authorities, most particularly those of Cannon.

The two paragraphs following contain something approaching a summary of these two attitudes, including (paragraph No. 1) the author's subordination of handedness to emotional conflicts:

1. The prevalence of stuttering among persons whose native handedness has been forcibly reversed merits serious consideration. I believe that it may be adequately explained on the basis of the individual's resistance to inhibition of, or interference with, normal bodily functions and the emotional conflict attendant upon such inhibition and interference. When such a condition exists a reversion to native handedness should assist in the alleviation of stuttering by removing at least one of a number of possible causes of emotional conflict.

2. The degree of dominance of motor cortex over thalamus depends directly upon the nature of the associational processes involved. It is my belief that the associational processes of the stutterer are of such a nature that in the situation where stuttering occurs, the control exercised by the motor cortex and that exercised by the thalamus are equal or nearly equal. The attempt to speak, —that is, the attempt to exercise voluntary motor control, is blocked by an involuntary attempt to prevent the motor activity. A complete blocking of speech occurs when the forces are of equal intensity. Increased effort to exercise cortical control results in muscular movements which may produce a sound, a syllable, a word, or a phrase. Such an effort may be met by a corresponding increase in thalamic activity, resulting in further inhibition of speech, and a consequent voluntary attempt to begin again. The situation may continue until the

effort at speech is abandoned, until the thought is successfully communicated in another form, or until it is communicated by the inadequate form of speech we call stuttering.

This paper, in its complete form, was presented at the 1929 meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association. In a footnote the author states that Doctor Cannon read the manuscript and expressed approval of this application of material derived from his own well known work, *Bodily Changes in Pain, Hunger, Fear and Rage.*

C. M. WISE, *Louisiana State University*

ALVEY, EDWARD, JR. *Organizing Units Around Functional Centers.* The English Journal, XXII, No. 2, February, 1933, 119-127.

Under this formidable technocratic title there is concealed a set of assignments for the teaching of conversation, presumably in high school. The assignments show careful planning and are given in full detail, so that any teacher might easily make use of them.

CONFREY, BURTON. *Selecting Subjects for Impromptu Talks.* Education, LIII, No. 5, January, 1933, 298-305.

Professor Confrey's article is devoted largely to the listing of topics for impromptu speeches. The subjects range from those of campus interest to those of international concern.

JENNES, ARTHUR. *The Role of Discussion in Changing Opinion Regarding a Matter of Fact.* Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXVII, No. 3, October-December, 1932, 279-295.

One hundred and one subjects, divided into four groups, "discussed" the question as to how many beans were in a sealed bottle. It was discovered that nearly all the subjects changed their estimates, although discussion apparently had little to do with it. Discussion apparently increased accuracy of judgment, when they knew that others held differing opinions. When they did not know of these differing opinions (although it is difficult to understand how "discussion" could be held without discovering such differences), this was not generally the case. Women change more than men, as a rule. Intelligence is apparently significant. The author points out as the most important conclusion the fact that "discussion is not effective in changing opinion unless the individuals who enter the discussion become aware of differences in opinion held by others." To which one might add that if the individuals who enter such a discussion do not become aware of

such differences, they haven't really entered the discussion at all, and there is little chance of a change of estimate. There may be a significant contribution in this article, but it seems to have been most adroitly concealed.

LAHMAN, CARROLL P. *Recent Trends in Speech Contests.* Educational News Bulletin (Kalamazoo, Mich.), III, No. 4, January, 1933, 13-16.

After reviewing specific instances of recent developments in speech contests, the writer summarizes the recent trends under three headings: (1) Wider participation. Through the introduction of a number of changes, "an increasing number of students are being given the valuable training of speaking to real audiences." (2) More genuine participation. Attention is centered on the student rather than on the coach. Directness and genuineness are the objectives. (3) Better directed participation. The best work will be done when all directors of speech contests are themselves trained in speech, and when "administrators look on contests merely as means to an educational end."

G. W. G.

LARSON, P. MERVILLE. *Objectives of Junior College Debating.* The Junior College Journal, III, No. 3, December, 1932, 141-43.

Mr. Larson wishes to give larger numbers of students the opportunity to debate—and on both sides of as many questions as can possibly be prepared by the squad. "Let us," he concludes, "make debating a real constructive force in secondary education by emphasizing its educational value rather than its contest and exhibitional value."

MCNEIL, MARSHALL. *Politico-Literary Souvenirs.* The American Spectator, I, No. 4, February, 1933, 3.

This article discusses, in Menckenian vein, the oratory and propaganda of the presidential campaign of 1932; the findings are summed in the sentence, "For all the literary values involved, the last Presidential campaign was a total loss." The speech of Governor Ely nominating Smith at Chicago, the speech of Smith at Boston, and the speech of Senator Glass over the radio are singled out for somewhat grudging praise.

PEMBERTON, ROBERT E. K. Advocatus Diaboli—*A Defense of the Rhetorical Education.* The Classical Journal, XXVIII, No. 1, October, 1932, 32-43.

In his defense of the rhetorical education Professor Pemberton stresses particularly the thoroughness, originality, and clarity of thought which were stimulated by the preparation and delivery of declamations on set topics. The "deliberative speech upon actual or imagined historical topics" called for a thorough knowledge of history as well as an unusual facility in interpretation. Although the speeches of controversy have often been indicted by those opposed to rhetorical training, Professor Pemberton reiterates the contention that the preparation of these speeches played an important part in the development of Roman Law. "Indeed it may fairly be claimed that the theory of rhetoric was, in its own degree, both a cause and an effect of the Roman genius for legal analysis, just as the much-derided declamations formed . . . . a really valuable influence towards the development of equity."

LESTER W. THONSSEN, *College of the City of New York*

UNTERMEYER, LOUIS. *The Lecture Platform.* The American Spectator, I, No. 5, March, 1933, 4.

The progress of the lecture business, says Mr. Untermeyer, might be charted as "from a Religion to a Racket." He reports that each year almost ten million dollars are spent for lecturers in the United States. The greater part of the article explains how a lecturer himself disintegrates and becomes "routinized" under continuous influences from audiences. But "the fault is almost wholly the lecturer's. He has misjudged, actually mistaken, his public; the audience of the lecture-hall becomes confused, in his mind, with the proverbial fourteen-year-old intelligence of the cinemas; he does not merely talk down, he thinks down to it."

WARREN, C. HENRY and LORD PONSONBY. *Culture on the Air: A Debate on the British Broadcasting Policy.* Fortnightly Review, January, 1933.

Mr. Warren opens his case with the assertion, which may or may not be true, that "with the possible exception of Germany the standard of broadcasting in Great Britain is higher than anywhere else in the world." "Whatever the shortcomings inherent in a monopoly,"

he goes on to say, "at least we have been saved from all the horrors of the system of broadcasting in America where the air is to be bought by the hour, where there are so many privately owned stations that jamming is almost inevitable, and when Bach and Beethoven are broadcast 'by the courtesy' of the manufacturers of the newest thing in corn-cures and face-creams." The B.B.C. assumes that broadcasting is a public service, and control was placed at once in the government.

The most flagrant sin today, says Mr. Warren, is indiscriminate listening; the loud-speaker is simply turned on to provide a background of noise. The B.B.C. aims to please everybody some of the time. The programs are designed for a discriminating public. But the B.B.C. refuses to admit that essentially broadcasting is entertainment, concentrating, instead, on education. This attitude is of doubtful value, first, because the public probably doesn't want to be educated, and second, it is doubtful if the radio is the best means. Education is too personal; the radio, it is assumed, offers a royal road to education and culture, when actually there is none. They are too much like "rubber-neck tours." The sole function of the radio is to entertain; that is what the B.B.C. should do, and what it is failing to do.

Lord Ponsonby agrees with much in Mr. Warren's argument, but disagrees with his conclusions. He points out the vast difference between music on the air, which is entertainment, and the spoken word, which is primarily educational. There *are* people who want education, plenty of them. Furthermore, education need not be dry and laborious—it can also be entertaining. The thirst for knowledge is wide-spread. School broadcasting and wireless discussion groups are on the increase. It is of utmost importance that the B.B.C. should extend its educational activities. A proper adjustment of entertainment, education, amusement, "can make the humblest listener feel that he is in possession not of a toy but of riches which no one can despise."

G. W. G.

WILLOUGHBY, RAYMOND R.: *The Functions of Conversation.* The Journal of Social Psychology, III, No. 2, May, 1932, 146-59.

Professor Willoughby's problem in research represents "an exploratory study . . . . designed to ascertain what motives and needs

could be discerned in their own conversational behavior by a group of mature, intelligent, and somewhat psychologically minded men and women, including a fair proportion who were conspicuously successful conversationalists." Among the tentative conclusions of the study are: (1) "one of the principal sources of satisfaction in conversation is the exercise of domination or display" and (2) distinctions between "playful" and "creative" conversation are recognized.

L. W. T.

The summer issue (June, 1932) of *La Psychologie Et La Vie* is given over completely to a consideration of the art of speaking. Among the specific topics discussed are: "The Art of Correct Speech," "Re-Education of the Speech of the Child," "Psychological Conditions of Extempore Speaking," and "Speech Aptitude."

The February, 1933, *Education* is given over largely to a study of motion pictures in education. The following titles are suggestive: "World Peace Through Motion Pictures"; "A Business Man Looks at Visual Education"; "Talking Motion Pictures in Chicago's New Plan"; "The Effectiveness of the Sound Motion Picture"; "The Next Step in Visual Education."

According to the *High School Journal* (Chapel Hill, North Carolina) the High School Debating Union of North Carolina is using the question, "Resolved that North Carolina should adopt the sales tax as a feature of its state system of revenue." The December, 1932, issue of the *Journal* (pp. 389-390) contains a preliminary analysis and definition of the question.

SPEECH IN THE SCHOOLS

COMMITTEE FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SPEECH EDUCATION IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS*

Aside from the work on major problems set up for solution during the year, the following activities have been pursued by the Committee:

1. A briefly annotated bibliography of books useful to the teacher of elementary speech activities was submitted to Rupert Cortright, editor of the *Speech Bulletin*, and accepted by him for inclusion in the May number of the *Bulletin*. It was hoped that this publication might be of immediate service to teachers in the elementary schools, and that it might also help to interest them in the publications of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION.

2. Through Mr. Densmore's office the Committee has attempted to interest in its work a number of teachers of elementary English and of other curricular subjects concerned definitely with speech activities. It was hoped that two ends might be served by this contagion of interest, namely: (1) establishment of contacts with persons whose opinions may be sought with regard to committee problems and whose classrooms might serve later as a proving ground for the experimental work of the Committee; (2) expansion of interest and membership in the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION.

3. At the beginning of the study, the chairman of your Committee kept in touch with the chairman of the Committee on Oral Composition of the National Council of Teachers of English, to insure co-operation and to avoid duplication of effort in activities common to both committees. This Committee has submitted its report to the English Council, in November. The report is concerned with activities, materials, and means, and enrichment of the "activity strand" in conversation, from kindergarten through grade six. The approach to conversation in this report is from the "content" rather than from the "proficiency" point of view. It contains much information of immense value to the elementary teacher of speech. We hope to obtain permission to incorporate many of the findings in this report with our own future reports concerning courses of study and methods.

*Under this title is printed a portion of the report made by this Committee at the National Convention, 1932, at Los Angeles. The personnel of the Committee was as follows: Grace Bridges, Supervisor of Auditoriums, Portland, Oregon; Lou Kennedy, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, New York; Carroll R. Lahman, Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo, Michigan; Emma Grant Meader, Russell Sage College, Troy, New York; Helen Osband, Alabama College for Women, Montevallo, Alabama; Vera Alice Paul, Georgia State Teachers College, Athens, Georgia; Carrie Rasmussen, Auditorium Teacher, Madison, Wisconsin; Arthur Secord, Paw Paw High School, Paw Paw, Michigan; Alice Slama, Nebraska Wesleyan University, Lincoln, Nebraska; Lucia May Wiant, Supervisor of Speech, Dayton, Ohio; and Mrs. Irene Poole, University of Michigan, Chairman.

Since the term "activity strands" is being applied to typical phases of English with which the English Council survey is concerned, would it not be advisable for similar committees of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH to adopt the term for use in their reports? This might prevent confusion of meanings. Your elementary school committee has been using the term "phases" for want of a better word. It is the feeling of the chairman, at least, that the better word now is "strands."

Your Committee has not attempted this year a thorough survey of current speech activities in practice in the elementary schools, because:

1. The unsettled condition of educational organization during the last three years precludes accuracy in estimating the importance of activities of a specialized nature.

2. Published material is very scarce; therefore the Committee would have to resort to the questionnaire method of research.

3. If this method were feasible, the Committee did not know where or to whom to address requests to obtain valid responses.

4. The process entails endless correspondence and unlimited expense that hardly seemed justified in view of the fact that there were so many other problems with which we might busy ourselves.

5. The value of information gained in this way is questionable for our present purposes.

Your Committee considered that more actual service could be rendered by constructive work on our immediate problems than by waiting for news regarding what is now being done. Nevertheless, the Committee hopes that as contacts with its interests and its work becomes more widely spread, it will be feasible to consider a complete survey of speech activities at all levels of the elementary school. Several members of the Committee are at work on this problem at the present time, and it is hoped that by the time of the next Convention we may have a substantial report to make on it.

Problems attacked by your Committee in March, 1932, follow:

1. Formulation of a professional bibliography for teachers' reference.

2. Compilation of a bibliography of material for use in the classroom.

3. Classification of phases (strands) of speech work to be emphasized in the elementary school, as creative dramatics, oral reading, story-telling, oral composition, phonetics, speech improvement.

4. Clarification of terminology so that the terms we use will be clearly understandable to workers in any field, and comparable to terms recognized at all levels in the speech field.

5. Evaluation of ultimate objectives, immediate aims, or ideals of each phase of the work at the different grade levels.

6. Determination of the most efficient place and most feasible time allotment for speech training in the several types of elementary school organization.

7. Organization of courses of study in each phase (strand), including a statement of minimal essentials of accomplishment at each grade level.

8. Suggested—and suggestive—methods.

On the pages that follow are some results of the Committee's accomplishment during 1932, with a forward look toward the work on courses of study.

The Committee asks that it be allowed to continue during 1933 with the work it has started, with such changes in personnel as will insure the greatest efficiency in the solution of the major problems we have for consideration.

The Committee requests that members of the Executive Council of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, and others who have suggestions and advice to offer with regard to any part of the work we have undertaken, will transmit them to the chairman or members of the Committee.

The members of the Committee for the Advancement of Speech Education in the Elementary Schools wish here to thank the President and the Executive Council of the National Association of Teachers of Speech for the privilege of working in this rich and hitherto unexplored field of speech education. We hope that the results obtained may be worthy of the aims and ideals of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION.

TENTATIVE STRANDS OF SPEECH ACTIVITY

A tentative classification of terms accepted by the critics whose opinions were sought in this study, that will probably form the basis of a proposed course of study for speech education in elementary schools:

I. Speech correction—
  prevention and correction of defects

II. General phases of speech techniques—
  phonetic training *via*
    enunciation *via* drills and games
    language games
  vocabulary enrichment
  bodily activity
    rhythmic games, gesture, posture, breath control
  voice training
  parliamentary activities [1]

III. Specialized speech activities—
  1. Creative dramatics
    pantomime
    shadowgraphs
    interpretation of character
      impersonation, acting
    pageantry
    puppets and marionettes
    costuming
    elementary stage management
  2. Interpretation
    oral reading of prose and poetry
    verse speaking
      memorized reading
      verse-speaking choirs

3. Original speaking
   extemporaneous speaking
     talks, reports
   impromptu speaking
   conversation
   interviewing
   discussion
     persuasive speaking
     criticism
   debating
   parliamentary activities [1]
4. Story-telling—
   recognized as the extemporaneous presentation of another's composition

OBJECTIVES OF THE ELEMENTARY SPEECH PROGRAM

This section is devoted to the determination of tenable aims for speech education in the elementary school, adapted and approved by comparison with the opinions of leaders in the fields of speech education and general education. Objectives have been confirmed as to the validity of their use by checking with such general principles of speech education as have been expressed in the publications of leading authorities in the field of speech education in high schools, colleges, and universities.

An indication of adequate education in speech is proficiency in all of the speech functions—both physical and social—that are involved in any situation that may occur in the life of the individual from the beginning to the end of his education.

The ultimate objectives of elementary speech, then, would be identical with those recognized at any other level of formal speech education. These we have found to be classified in five large categories:

1. Personality adjustment to social situations.
2. Efficient use of the speech mechanisms in human intercourse.
3. Ease of thought-expression and control of thought-processes.
4. Proficiency in speech skills—those required of the adult professions, as actor, lawyer, preacher, teacher, etc.
5. Active appreciation of spoken and written literature.

The following four principles guide the progress of speech education now in effect, as reported in professional publications:

1. Proficiency in speech activities in their neuro-muscular aspects.
2. Efficient and beautiful communication of thought and emotions.
3. Intellectual clarity.
4. Personality adjustment to social conduct (the integration of the first three principles).

Testing the five objectives (the first list) for elementary speech education against this list of general principles, we find sufficient convergence to con-

[1] There was a difference of opinion about the placing of this activity.

firm the validity of the five objectives for purposes of outlining the more immediate aims of speech education, and for the foundation upon which to build a unified course of study for the elementary grades.

The immediate aims of speech training for children may be classed as follows:

I. Those concerned with the hygiene of speech
   1. Adequate functioning of the physical mechanism of speech.

II. Those concerned with special speech activities
   2. Acquisition of good diction and accepted pronunciation.
   3. Thought-expression through freedom of bodily movement.
   4. Efficiency in vocal and articulatory expression.
   5. Practice in expressing thoughts clearly and accurately.
   6. Techniques necessary to influence the behavior of others.

III. Those concerned with cultural developments
   7. Development of individual personality.
   8. Effective audience relationships.
   9. Appreciation of literature through the oral interpretation of written English.
   10. Training in leadership through the preparation and execution of group activities.

IV. Those concerned with administration of the program
   11. Correlation with all other subjects of study.
   12. Preparation for secondary school courses.

Doctor Woolbert, in the Introduction to *Fundamentals of Speech*, makes the following interesting statements: "A man speaking is four things, all of them needed to reveal his mind to others. First, he is a will, an intention, a meaning which he wishes others to have, a thought. Second, he is a user of language, molding thought and feeling into words. Third, he is a thing to be heard, carrying his purpose and words to others through voice. Last, he is a thing to be seen, shown to the sight, a being of action to be noted and read through the eye.

"The best of these is to have meaning, next to master words, third to control voice, and last to govern the outer manner. But these are met in the reverse order from their value. A man speaking is first seen, then heard, then understood, then known for what he is. First men see, then hear, then understand.

"Therefore the steps in speech training, especially in relearning are (1) study of action, (2) study of voice and oral expression, (3) study of language and composition, and (4) study of impulses, desires, wishes, meanings."

Granting the validity of this assumption, the earliest education in speech activities should be that concerned with action, followed by training in the vocal and articulatory mechanisms and techniques, which combination would form firm bases for attention to oral language and composition, with later study of motives and methods of persuasion, or influencing the behavior of others.

The more immediate aims, then, of elementary speech education should be directed toward the accomplishment of the first two of Dr. Woolbert's steps, with but anticipatory direction toward the last two. The basic aims at each grade level would not, therefore, be identical, but would be determined by the progress attained in each of the preceding steps, beginning in the kindergarten and nursery school with the most fundamental elements of rhythm and pantomime.

Here we have the point of departure for the work of the Committee for the Advancement of Speech Education in Elementary Schools for 1933.

SUGGESTED METHODS FOR ORAL COMPOSITION

(IRENE POOLE)

From Sheridan we take a few general suggestions as to method:[2]

1. Teach a few things thoroughly and give abundant practice in these few fundamental things.

2. Good speech is a matter of habit, and there is no evidence that the formal study of grammar induces children to speak correctly.

3. Children must have a chance to talk, and not have to listen most of the time to the teacher.

4. Socialized recitations give pupils a motive to talk well.

5. Seating must be arranged to allow pupils to see each other's faces, rather than the backs of their necks.

6. Since right speech is mainly a matter of the ear, the children should be given opportunity, in a natural situation, to hear and say the right forms often enough to make them sound right.

7. Language games, with the object to "bombard the pupil's ears with right forms," is an effective device.

8. The "sentence sense" is pertinent, and can best be achieved by the daily use of short three-sentence compositions, with every child having a chance to talk every day.

9. Subjects should be personal and brief, presenting only a single phase of a well-known experience.

10. The beginning sentence should give "the heart of the subject" and the ending sentence should leave an active impression of the topic.

In his program for the primary grades, Sheridan gives more specific devices: Short one, two, and three-sentence compositions, stressing free, spontaneous, hearty self-expression; "get acquainted" talks, telling things about one's self and interests; talks about pets; talks about daily experiences; use of correct forms by constant direction and drill by the use of language games; drill in distinct speech, with special stress on final consonants; improving characteristic weaknesses by avoidance of trite beginnings and endings, as "I have," "I like," etc., by skilful question and criticism.

For work in the intermediate grades, the following are suggested: "All written work should grow out of oral work, but oral work should receive by far the greater attention"; four or five-sentence compositions; children should select

2 Bernard M. Sheridan. *Speaking and Writing English* (Chicago, 1929).

a particular phase of their experience and observation, and tie up every sentence to that; there should be much daily criticism; compare children's offerings with illustrative compositions; occasional stenographic reports of pupils' compositions allow them to observe their own progress; reading and answering letters orally gives a "personal" feeling; daily use of speech drills and language games; discovery and application of expressive words and word-values through dictionary reference and critical reading; unit sentence and paragraph structure by means of questioning, criticism, and comparison with models; insistence upon distinct speech by teaching the pupils to open their mouths when they speak, speak slowly in a low, clear voice, and enunciate final consonants.

Work with upper grades continues all of these methods, with the addition of: enlarging the vocabulary and introducing the use of vivid words through dictionary study, comparison with classic compositions, and criticism; use of compound and complex sentences by combining simple sentences, or by critical examination and discussion to determine relative values of long and short sentences; sentence betterment through transforming, combining, condensing, and otherwise varying sentences to see how to express thoughts more pleasingly and effectively; assigned topics for oral report.

Hosic [3] does not go into detail in the matter of method, but he makes recommendations that include: intelligent, eager, long-continued practice under guidance and criticism; appeal to strong and effective motives for expression such as desire to give pleasure to others, to express and support an opinion, and to enjoy for one's self the mastery of an art; first-hand observation and free play of imagination to induce originality of expression; facts and principles of language should be taught and used when they are needed for use; impromptu reports and discussions; retelling of stories after repeated hearings, when the story has been assimilated and made the pupil's own; dramatization, worked out by the children; memorization of poetry after having discovered the whole thought.

Young and Memmott [4] also recommend the three-sentence plan for early composition, for these reasons; every child has a chance to recite in a period; each child can easily tell *three things*, therefore his self-confidence is also being developed; it is necessary to concentrate upon the point of the story and omit irrelevant and uninteresting details; the class can concentrate more easily on the particular thing that is being developed; it makes for sentence consciousness, if the child is taught to let his voice fall after each of the three statements.

From the point of view of the speech teacher, the remark concerning letting the voice fall after each sentence is, perhaps, fallacious. Sheridan subscribes to the same notion.[5]

If we are trying to develop spontaneity and are constantly avoiding formal methods of speaking, we must refrain from any suggestion of formality and of mechanical perfection in our teaching. The inflection of all simple sentences does not fall at the end of the sentence. It would be a very monotonous composition whose every thought ended in exactly the same way. And it is a dan-

3 James Fleming Hosic, *The Elementary Course in English* (Chicago, 1911).
4 Nell J. Young and Frederick W. Memmott, *Methods in Elementary English* (1923).
5 *Op. cit.*, 58.

gerous precedent to teach in the early grades any principle that may have to be overcome in a later class.

It is true that one of the most profound problems of the teacher of little children is to correct the tendency to run thoughts together with connectives—words or syllables. Perhaps it would be better to suggest to the child that he pause between his thoughts. One teacher has found the remark, "Begin your thought with a capital letter, and end it with a period," to be effective with intermediate grade children who have had experience in writing. It would not be an effective device for younger children, whose sense of sentence-structure is undeveloped.

SUGGESTED METHODS FOR DRAMATICS

(IRENE POOLE)

Opinions as to the best procedures in dramatics range from the free, spontaneous, impromptu "taking the characters" of a story that has been told, to the formal writing, learning lines with cues and business, and producing a play, with costumes.

Of this form of speech training, Hosic[6] says that if worked out by the children themselves, dramatization is a useful form of reproduction in the primary grades but it should never degenerate into a mere exercise for entertainment. This form of expression should gradually be replaced in grades above the second by reading of parts and by the arranging of plays in writing.

Perhaps the most illuminating suggestions for creative work in the upper grades are presented by Miss Ward in her book on this activity.[7] She gives considerable emphasis to complete understanding of the plot and situations of the story that is to be dramatized, and to intimate appreciation of the characters and how they would be likely to react to certain situations. She would have more time in the upper grades spent on study and understanding of the play than upon actual preparation in rehearsal. If this principle has proved essential for older children, how much more indispensable it would be with younger children whose imagination must be stimulated from a more meagre background!

"Peter Pan" and "Four Musicians of Bremen" are reported by Dr. Meader as having been presented in an English school by children who wore masks to represent the characters. The masks had been made by the pupils. In the case of each dramatization, attention was directly called to the speech elements as well as to the acting. This was always done after the production was completed and the pupils had returned to their seats.[8]

Whatever the use to which dramatization is put in a classroom situation, it should always be the children's own work. Even costuming defeats the primary purpose of dramatics, which in these grades should be the interpretation—not by artificial means, but by faculties within the person who is interpreting.

One technique at a time should constitute the complete activity for any age or age group. Action, being the basic feature of interpretation, ought to come

[6] *Op. cit.*, 21.

[7] Winifred Louise Ward, *Creative Dramatics* (1930).

[8] Emma Grant Meader, *Teaching of Speech in the Elementary Schools of England and the United States* (1928).

first in the program. In the early grades and kindergarten, pantomime should be the chief means of dramatic expression. The simple game of charades is an interesting exercise in motivated pantomime. Technical work—if we may call it that in its simplest form—should be directed to freedom of bodily movement, expression through physical means, gesture, facial expression, and rhythm and tempo in accord with the mood.

Later on, vocal interpretation can be taken up. The children observe the essential qualities of voices as they express different feelings. Rate of speaking and inflections characteristic of moods should be studied. These can then be combined with pantomime in the characterization of a person in the story. Basic audience courtesies from the observers and courtesies to the observers—letting them see one's face, not standing directly in front of another player, or playing where one can be seen by all members of the audience—can be suggested to little children.

In the third and fourth grades, the stage picture may be discussed with profit. Balance, emphasis, interest, color, rhythm, can be applied here in the picture-study of their art classes. Cues and simple stage directions can be used consistently by students of this age. They can also take care of their own direction and stage management. Costumes should be makeshift affairs of the children's creation from curtains, drapes, old clothing, and what not. If children are left to their own devices and responsibility, their resourcefulness amazes an adult. They are better satisfied with their own creation, however crude, than one which has been handed them complete.

Puppetry offers all sorts of possibilities for original creation and effective vocal performance. Very little children can construct their own figures from cardboard and string. Older children combine this activity with classes in art and woodwork, and achieve remarkable workable jointed figures from blocks of wood, *papier-mache*, cotton, and wire. Orange crates or even smaller store boxes make excellent theatres. These can be placed on a table or chair, so that the children can watch their own performances from the top. Curtains can be of real cloth, or of cardboard, like a real act-drop. Often a backward child, who lacks bodily control and finds it difficult to impersonate a character on the stage, gives convincing lines to his puppet.

SUGGESTED METHODS FOR DELIVERY

(IRENE POOLE)

In one school the speech game was governed by an objective set of "five-finger rules." The thumb indicated the content of the speech or talk or story, toward which all the other factors should work for effective presentation. The little finger stood for posture—the first thing we notice about a speaker. The ring finger represented the voice, which is the next thing we notice. The middle finger was diction and pronunciation. Even before we are aware of the content of the speech, our attention is called to composition, so the index finger stood for correct English construction. Just as the thumb is helpless to do work without assistance from the fingers, the speech cannot be effective without the assistance of all the other factors of delivering it. These five-finger rules were,

in this school, the criteria for preparing talks, for delivering them, and for criticizing them.

Posture includes the whole of bodily action used in all types of speaking. The big problem here is to get freedom of bodily movement and appropriate gesture to assist with verbal expression. Pantomime is an effective exercise for this purpose. If a child, in an audience situation, tries to tell his thoughts without voice, but with articulatory movements, he usually finds it simple to transfer the accompanying gesture to the speaking situation. Let him imagine he has lost his voice.

Occasionally there is an older child who has great difficulty in accomplishing this in the class. For him, the "chair drill" is useful. From a comparatively relaxed position sitting down, let him practice talking, using his hands as much as he can. (It sometimes helps to suggest that he should mimic a foreigner he has seen.) Most children have little difficulty in "suiting the action to the word" while they are seated. They may drill themselves in this use of emphasizing gesture before attempting to talk before the class or from the platform. This has proved to be a better method for encouraging appropriate action than having the child practice before a mirror, because it discourages self-consciousness.

The most natural first step in delivery is the acquisition of bodily movement, pantomime, gesture. But if for any particular child this is awkward and does not give the desired result, let the child begin his course of training with something he can do with the least effort and develop ease of delivery step by step as he gains control of his thoughts, voice, and articulation.

The speaker's voice must be clear, loud enough to be heard, of a pleasing quality and pitch, and with varied and appropriate inflections. There may be some indication of character in the voice, if the story has several characters in it. The rate of speaking should be regulated to fit the size and type of the room and the audience, and the spirit of the story. Little more than a suggestion to lower the pitch ("Use your bass voice") or to increase volume and force ("Let us all hear you") is necessary to get results with most speakers.

The regulation of speed is a more difficult task. Generally speaking, the fast talkers are either the quick thinkers or those who suffer from a generally accelerated physiological metabolism. These latter present a problem for the physician, and until their physiological problem is corrected it were best not to call attention to the speed of their speech. For the other group, whose thoughts travel faster than their tongues, much patience is required to adjust the two factors by suggesting pauses between thoughts and phrases, prolongation of vowel sounds, clear enunciation, accent and stress, and respect for listeners.

In presenting variety of voice it is helpful to use descriptive words or phrases that are easily within the range of childish comprehension, as "squeaky," "coarse," "smooth," "whiny," "soprano," "bass," "like a frog," "like a bird," "like your mother's when you have hurt yourself, or when she says goodnight," etc. Any device that assists the child in his perception of quality should be used extravagantly. His imitative sense will help him to approximate the quality in his own voice.

With fair examples to copy, children soon develop a taste for good diction and accepted pronunciation, and put it into practice before their classmates in their speech programs. They develop a critical attitude toward their own speech as well as toward that of their friends, and take delight in settling discussions about pronunciation by referring to the dictionary. As soon as the desire and need arises, they should be taught the phonetic alphabet so that they may use pronouncing dictionaries with efficiency. Speech drills of the phonetic type may be introduced where they seem to be needed as a class exercise. Individual problems of diction may dictate drills to fit individual needs.

Speech-consciousness, or audience-consciousness, or self-consciousness, plus a speech situation equals stage fright. The condition is essentially one of direction of energy. If the thought-energy is centered in self and a strange situation, there can be no end but self-consciousness. The preventive is self-confidence. The time to cure stage fright is before it begins. A child should be able to recognize no difference between speaking before his class in a definite speech exercise and explaining an arithmetic problem at the blackboard. If he has acquired a tendency toward nervousness and anxiety in anticipation of a speech situation, it has probably been allowed to develop by parents' and teachers' admonitions on previous occasions to "Do your best now," "Make us proud of you," etc., etc.

If a teacher knows a child to be worried about his coming talk or appearance on a program, she should use every effort to keep his attention directed away from the situation. Chance remarks or quiet conversation about any subject but the program, the child's responsibility in it, or the audience, sending the child on a simple errand while he waits to speak, engaging him in games or tasks with others of his classmates, and avoidance of last-minute rehearsals and admonitions, may be suggestive as methods for inspiring momentary self-confidence. A number of successful experiences will help the child to develop an "at home" feeling in his situation, and he will be more than willing to add to his success by subsequent experiences.

SUGGESTED METHODS AND TECHNIQUES: AN UNGRADED LIST

(EMMA GRANT MEADER)

1. Special lessons in motivating good speech (for all grades).
2. Relaxation and breathing exercises.
3. Ear training, leading to recognition of correct sounds and acceptance of agreeable, pleasing sounds in words, poems, speech.
4. Special drills for flexible speech agents, as lips, tongue, front placing, correction of nasal twang, or special disabilities.
5. Individual work for those who have marked speech defects, as stuttering, lisping, etc.
7. Exercises suited to individual needs for the elimination of foreign accent.
8. Sentence and word drills.
9. Improving pronunciation.
10. Building a vocabulary.

11. Social conversation lessons about things and activities in which children are interested.
12. Slang expressions and better English substitutes.
13. Dramatization, including the puppet show.
14. Current events (for good delivery, practice in speech, etc.)
15. Oral interpretative reading; oral composition; story-telling.
16. Verse-speaking, as individuals, as a class, and in a choir.
17. Persuasive speaking in the upper grades.
18. Debating in upper grades.
19. Parliamentary procedure in upper grades; a club meeting.
20. Interviews: business, as applying for a position or convincing a prospective buyer; the journalistic interview of great men, etc.
21. Book reviews; committee reports; group discussions.
22. The use of Victrola records of good speakers.
23. Victrola records of English sounds.
24. Simple phonetics as an aid to correcting speech sounds in any grade. A few symbols can be introduced in upper grades.
25. Effective radio speaking.
26. A poetry hour; a reading club.

COURSE OF STUDY

(HELEN OSBAND)

This is what we try to accomplish in each grade. Of course work overlaps and is repeated in each grade—but our plan is:

Kindergarten: Pantomime; some sound accuracy; tongue and lip movement.

Grade 1: Vowel and consonant accuracy; speech correction mainly.

Grade 2: Beginning of listening to sounds; repeating of sounds; range, force, pitch. (Examples: we mimic cows, chickens, doves; tell what the three bears said, in varying pitch, etc.)

Grade 3: Beginning to need relaxation badly. We imitate the wind, etc., for breath control, tongue and lip movement, etc. We do a great deal with creative dramatics and thus aim for clearness of speech.

Grade 4: The children begin to give back. Tell the stories; do much pantomime; play games; make up games; try to give time for individual to think on feet.

Grade 5: Use pantomime a great deal (help with self-consciousness); play games; speech composition begun; try for resonance and tone quality.

Grade 6: Too self-conscious for much pantomime. Begin observation of good speech in others; use all manner of competition; tongue twisters a favorite device; breath control emphasized; some idea of what it's all about; resonance explained; tests given for control, etc.

TIME ALLOTMENT

(HELEN OSBAND)

We find from actual experience the seemingly best time for speech is directly after the play period or recess. First, relaxation drills are given; then breathing; then the special speech problem. Our method could be used only in practice school. Each of the students (usually I have five or six) has certain definite pupils in her charge; she knows their speech habits and their difficulties. (I doubt, however, that the pupils themselves know this, as it is done unobtrusively.) If one child who has had particular difficulty does unusually well, attention is called to him proudly and he recites alone. If the case is difficult for group work, the individual is given special attention at another time.

A fifteen-minute period each day has proved adequate time for special drills. Of course the speech work should be carried over into other fields. This does *not* include time for creative dramatics, which I consider should show the results of speech training but not be included in the time allotted for it. Nor does it include story-telling. We allot fifteen minutes each week, which is not enough time for story-telling. This is also a laboratory course. The girls tell the stories and we have a definite schedule of the kind of stories told in each grade.

SUGGESTED COURSE OF STUDY

(LUCIA MAY WIANT)

The Dayton course is built upon the theory that good habits of speech should be established in the formative years of child life.

Grades 1 and 2: Emphasis upon faultless articulation, clear conversation, and correct pronunciation.

Phonics used as a means to secure distinct speech.

Dramatization introduced as stimulant to freedom and naturalness.

Grades 3 and 4: Intensify work of Grades 1 and 2.

Dictionary work; diacritical markings for pronunciation.

Memorizing gems from literature, one each week.

Grades 5 and 6: Aim to develop the child in character, self-confidence, initiative, poise, individuality.

Emphasis upon voice development, breathing, vocabulary.

Grades 7 and 8: Correlate ideas with earlier training to become an effective speaker, free from embarrassment.

Practice with short conversational topics.

Research topics for extemporaneous speaking.

NEWS AND NOTES

(Please send items of interest for this department directly to Miss Lousene Rousseau, 49 East 33rd Street, New York City.)

A High School Poetry Speaking Festival and Extempore Speaking Contest was held at Indiana Central College February 24th, sponsored by the Speech Arts Honor Society of the College, under the direction of Miss Leora Weimar. College scholarships and book awards were given to participants who showed particular merit. The two contests were held simultaneously, all high school students being eligible to participate in one, and a final evening contest brought together the winners in both in an Honors program. Three groups of poems were prepared for the poetry section, from which each contestant selected two. The Advisory Council of the Festival was composed of H. B. Gough of DePauw University, Lee Norvelle of Indiana University, Miss Winnifred Ray of Wiley High School in Terre Haute, Ray H. Myers of Bloomington High School, Bishop H. H. Faut of Indianapolis, and President I. J. Good of Indiana Central College.

The Third Annual Convention of the Indiana Association of Teachers of Speech was held late in October. At the dramatics section, where Lee Norvelle presided, H. B. Gough spoke upon "The Educational Aims of Amateur Dramatics"; Vergil Smith, of Marion High School, discussed "Problems of the High School Students in Character Acting"; Miss Mildred Harter, of Gary High School, discussed "The Relationship of Diction to Interpretation." Herold Ross, of DePauw University, was chairman of the debate section, at which talks were given by Robert Huber, of Mishawaka High School, and Donald Bowen, of Indiana University. Alan Monroe, of Purdue University, addressed a general session of the convention upon the subject of "Individual Development Through Speech." At the afternoon session, which was held jointly with the English teachers, the farce-comedy *Lotus Flowers* was presented by students of LaPorte High School, under the direction of Miss Pearl Young, after which James L. Lardner, of the School of Speech of Northwestern University, read Browning's "Andrea del Sarto." New officers of the Indiana Association are as follows: President, Ray H. Myers; Vice-President, Vergil Smith; Secretary-Treasurer, Myron Phillips; Editor, Herold T. Ross; Director, Alan H. Monroe.

At DePauw University, on December 8th and 9th, was held a meeting of Indiana critic teachers of English and Public Speaking, which was part of the program of the Eighth Annual State Conference on Supervised Student Teaching.

The new officers of the Illinois Association of Teachers of Speech are as follows: President, Dean Ralph Dennis, Northwestern University; Vice-

President, H. D. Johnson, Pekin High School; Secretary-Treasurer, A. D. Huston, University of Illinois; Editor, Miss Mary Blackburn, Granite City High School.

The Speech and Dramatics Section of the Southern Wisconsin Teachers' Association met at Madison February 10th and 11th, with Miss Theodora E. Jax, of Beaver Dam, as chairman. The general program included a reading by Miss Gertrude Johnson, of the University of Wisconsin, and papers on high school speech problems by H. A. Ahrnsbrak of Beaver Dam High School and George W. Anderson of Waukesha High School. The balance of the program consisted of round-table groups on interpretation and dramatics, classroom and contest speech, and speech correction. In charge of the last two groups were Miss Gladys Borchers, of the University of Wisconsin and Dr. Robert West, also of the University of Wisconsin.

The Second Annual Rocky Mountain Speech Conference was held at the University of Denver Saturday, January 14. The first feature of the program was an intercollegiate cross-examination debate on the proposition: "Resolved: that at least one-half of all state and local taxes should be raised from intangibles." The teams were composed of freshmen of the University of Denver and the Colorado State Teachers College. The main speeches were nine minutes in length, followed in each case by a five-minute cross-examination by an opposing speaker. High school delegates present participated in an open forum following the debate, and critical analyses of the debate followed, in which L. A. Mallory, of the University of Wyoming, discussed the analysis and case; Claude Wilson, of the Boulder Preparatory High School, discussed the evidence; Wilbur E. Moore, of Colorado Agricultural College, handled refutation, and questioning; and Miss Mattie Vie Lendrum, of North High School in Denver, discussed delivery and style. Then followed discussions and illustrations of auditorium and grade school speech projects. A program in advanced interpretation of poetry was given by students of representative high schools, and various phases of the work were then discussed by Lester Raines, of New Mexico Normal University, Miss Bernadetta Daly, Manual Training High School, of Denver, Florence Lamont Hinman, of the Lamont School of Music in Denver, and Helen Rumsey Robinson, of Colorado Woman's College. A formal program on speech fundamentals followed, with Miss Erna P. Triplett as chairman. The speakers were the following:

"Poise and Adjustment to Speech Situations"—Elwood Murray, University of Denver.

"Vocal Cultivation"—E. H. Baxter Rinquest, Rinquest School of Music.

"Physical Bearing and Action"—D. Mack Easton, University of Colorado.

"Beauty and Correctness of Utterance"—Announcer Vance Graham, Station KOA.

"Speech Standards"—Vida R. Sutton, National Broadcasting Company.

The next section of the Conference discussed various phases of the National High School Debate Question, which concerns taxation, the speakers being economists and tax experts of the University of Colorado. A symposium on methods of enlisting student interest in speech activities, and two programs of

stories closed the morning meetings. Following the luncheon, at which the main address was given by Principal Max D. Morton, of the Thatcher School of Pueblo, the section for discussing debate problems convened, with Norman Davies as chairman. The program was as follows:

"Aim of Debate"—J. M. Tobin, Opportunity School, Denver.

"What a Critic Judge Looks For"—Alfred Westfall, Colorado Agricultural College.

"Function of the Coach"—Wilbur E. Stevens, University of Wyoming.

"Etiquette, Sportsmanship"—W. D. Copeland, Colorado College.

"Cross-Examination Techniques"—Clifford W. Mills, Westminster Law School, Denver.

The program on dramatic arts, with Miss Katherine Ommanney, of North High School in Denver, as chairman, was as follows:

"Creative Dramatics"—Lester Raines, New Mexico Normal University.

"Casting to Develop Personalities vs. Casting for Exhibition"—Marion Robinson, University of Denver.

"Modern Lighting for the School Stage"—Richard G. Ellinger, State Teachers College.

"Techniques of Make-up with a Demonstration"—Margaret Blackburn, State Teachers College.

"Some Production Techniques"—Walter Sinclair, Denver Civic Theatre.

"Functional Dramatics"—Miss Frances Tobey, State Teachers College.

Technical problems in speech pathology and correction were discussed by Ruth Pirtle, Texas Technological College, Janet Chatin, Walsenburg Public Schools, Margaret Sullivan, Denver, Betty Pollard, University of Denver, Vira Wilson, Evans School of Denver, and Julia Wright, Denver Public Schools. A program of verse-speaking was given by choirs from Scottsbluff, Nebraska, under the direction of Miss Alice Maynard; Manual Training High School in Denver, under Miss Bernadetta Daly; and the Greeley High School, directed by Helen G. McGrew.

The program on speech programs in the grades, with Miss Lila O'Boyle of the Whittier School in Denver as chairman, was as follows:

"Speech Objectives for the Auditorium"—Pearl Queree, Boulevard School, Denver.

"Speech Training and Mental Hygiene of Children"—Maude Love, Ft. Morgan Schools.

"Oral Literature for Children"—Frances Tobey, State Teachers College.

"Minimum Speech Proficiency for Teachers in the Grades"—G. S. Willey, Director of Teacher Training, University of Denver.

"Creative Stage Settings for Children"—Lucille Snow, State Teachers College.

The program of the section on advanced speech training and research, with Harry Ketcham as chairman, was as follows:

"Character as a Factor in Persuasion as Presented by Aristotle"—D. Mack Easton, University of Colorado.

"Spranger's 'Six Types of Men' as a Basis for Audience Analysis"—Gerald Willsea.

"Measuring Personality Growth in a Class in Speech Fundamentals"—Glenn Moore, University of Denver.

"Stylistic Techniques in the Oratory of James Madison"—Wilbur E. Moore, Colorado Agricultural College.

"An Investigation of Traits as Found in Mature Debaters as Compared with Mature Actors"—J. A. Tracy, University of Denver.

A further discussion of aspects of the high school debate question, a program of Shakespeare scenes presented by students of Loretto Heights College and the University of Denver, a reception to visitors, and a performance of *The Crime at Blossoms*, by Mordaunt Shairp, under the direction of Walter Sinclair, at the University of Denver Civic Theatre, concluded the conference.

The annual meeting of the Department of Speech of the Missouri State Teachers Association was held at the Hotel Baltimore in November, with one hundred twenty-six teachers in attendance at the luncheon and meeting. The program was as follows:

"A Ten Weeks' Course in Debating"—D. E. Tugel, Beaumont High School, St. Louis.

"The High School Play"—Miss Edna Gales, West Junior High, Kansas City.

"College Dramatics"—George Phelps, Kansas City Horner Institute of Fine Arts.

"Speech Work in the Missouri Schools—R. L. Davidson, University of Missouri.

After the program it was decided to form a permanent organization of Missouri speech teachers, and the following officers were elected: President, Miss Bessie Gay Secrest, Kansas City, Southwest High School; Vice-President, Forrest Rose, State Teachers College, Cape Girardeau; Secretary-Treasurer, H. M. Doxsee, St. Louis, Cleveland High School.

The first radio courses in speech in that section of the country are now offered by the University of Denver. The courses are one in radio continuity writing, one in broadcasting methods, and one in principles of broadcasting. The courses are open to everybody, and are in charge of Roscoe K. Stockton, Director of Station KOA in Denver.

The South Dakota Speech Association has issued the first number of its new publication, *The South Dakota Speech Bulletin*, a 24-page booklet, mimeographed, containing brief articles on all phases of speech work, book reviews, and news items. It will be published three times a year, under the direction of the Executive Council of the Association, composed of Clarence Jacobson, Rapid City High School, George Bohman, Dakota Wesleyan University, and Upton Palmer, Rapid City High School.

Four courses in public speaking and dramatics will be offered in the Washington University Summer Session at St. Louis. The staff will consist of William G. B. Carson, Raymond F. Howes, and Robert F. Young, and the courses will include the technique of the drama, oral interpretation of literature, phonetics, and public speaking. This program is much more extensive than Washington University has ever offered during the summer.

FORENSICS

The Reserve Rostrum of Western Reserve University is again engaging extensively in the discussion of questions of current interest before audiences of all types in Cleveland and vicinity. Some of the subjects upon which speakers are prepared to speak or debate are as follows: Limitation of Incomes and Inheritance, Capitalism, Unemployment, Prohibition, Taxation, Appointment of Judges, Banking, Russia, Birth Control, Home Rule for India, Third Party in the United States, The Youth Movement, etc. Besides the Forum debates, a program of some eighteen intercollegiate debates has also been scheduled.

A debate between the University of Notre Dame and Purdue University opened the third annual debate conference at Purdue University early in December, the question being the popular one of taxation. N. J. Weiss of Albion College, Michigan, acted as the critic judge. Dean Ralph Dennis, of the Northwestern University School of Speech, addressed the conference. The program was in charge of P. E. Lull of Purdue and Miss Venemann, secretary of the conference.

Among the debate teams from foreign universities visiting the country this year is an Irish team from Trinity College, Dublin.

The final events in the annual competitions of the Wisconsin High School Forensic Association are the final debate, which is scheduled at the State Capitol on March 23, the State Dramatic Contest, scheduled for East Side High School, Madison, the following day, and the final contests in oratory, declamation, etc., to be held in Madison on May 11 and 12. At the same time as the earliest of these contests, the University of Wisconsin is acting as host for the Intercollegiate Public Speaking and Debate Tournament, to which all high school delegates are invited. The debate proposition for the tournament is: "Resolved: That all banking functions should be regulated by the Federal Government, with deposits guaranteed." The general subject for the public speaking contest is "This Question of War Debts."

A radio broadcast of interest to speech teachers was held on February 11, when an international radio debate was held between representatives from Yale University, who spoke from the New York studios of the National Broadcasting Company, and representatives from Cambridge University, speaking from Broadcasting House, London, the new headquarters of the British Broadcasting Company. The debate was heard in the United States at 5 P. M., over a nation-wide hook-up, and in Europe at 10 P. M., Greenwich Time. The question was: "Resolved: That the immediate and complete cancellation of War Debts and Reparations is necessary to World Recovery." Yale upheld the negative of the proposition. The presiding officer was James G. McDonald, President of the Foreign Policy Association.

Evidence of the popularity which debating can have in a school: 128 students tried out for the twelve places on the permanent squad in Luverne, Minnesota.

An interesting experiment is reported from Wisconsin, where the Department of Rural Sociology of the College of Agriculture of the State University has adopted discussion and debate as a part of the program for the enrichment of rural life, which already includes dramatics, music, plays and games. The

experiment has been enthusiastically received, and will be a part of next year's program. Formal programs in the new branches were held at the College of Agriculture in Madison on February 2, with H. L. Ewbank as chairman of the discussion program, and J. H. Kolb, of the Department of Rural Sociology, in charge of the debate program. Karl Windesheim, of the Speech Department of the University of Washington, acted as critic judge of the discussion contest.

DRAMATICS

Recent major productions by the Cornell Dramatic Club, now in its twenty-fourth season, include: Galsworthy's *Windows*, Congreve's *Way of the World*, and two nineteenth-century revivals, *East Lynne*, and *The Drunkard, or The Fallen Saved*. In addition to its regular programs of shorter plays, the Club presented last December a special program of one-act plays by Martin W. Sampson, late Professor of English at Cornell. A. M. Drummond is Director of the Club and W. H. Stainton Assistant Director.

Winter performances of the Dakota Playmakers have included Shaw's *You Never Can Tell*, John Balderston's *Berkeley Square*, and *The First Mrs. Fraser*. Ibsen's *Peer Gynt* will be presented April 19. The plays are under the direction of E. D. Schonberger.

Performances at the Laboratory Theatre of the University of Michigan, under the direction of Valentine B. Windt, have included, for the first half of the year, *The Adding Machine*, *Beggar on Horseback*, *Hedda Gabler*, and *The Rivals*. Last summer the Michigan Repertory Players, a group of actors selected from the courses in Play Production, presented *Mr. Pim Passes By*, *Paola and Francesca*, *At Mrs. Beam's*, *Berkeley Square*, *Around the World in 80 Days*, *Once in a Lifetime*, *The Chalk Circle*, and *Trojan Women*.

The College Theatre at Alabama College, Montevallo, has recently presented *The Chalk Circle*, translated from the Chinese by Ethel VanderVeer, *Bonds of Interest*, by Benavente, and *Mr. Pim Passes By*, under the direction of Walter H. Trumbauer. *East Lynne* and *The Man Who Married a Dumb Wife* are scheduled for later production.

HENRY LAWRENCE SOUTHWICK (1863—1932)

President Henry Lawrence Southwick of Emerson College, Boston, died at his home in Boston on December 30, 1932, as the result of a heart attack. He had been connected with Emerson College for thirty-eight years, as secretary, dean, acting president, and president; in the last capacity he was serving his twenty-fourth year when he died.

In 1895 Mr. Southwick organized at Emerson College a group of students for the acting of Shakespeare; productions were presented at the Boston Museum and in various New England cities. In March, 1897, the group played a full week at the Tremont Theatre. Mr. Southwick himself was for a time a member of Augustin Daly's Shakespearean company which made a tour of England and Scotland.

As an inspirational speaker and as an interpreter of Shakespeare, President Southwick enjoyed wide esteem, and for many years he made lecturing tours to various parts of the United States and to Canada. In addition to his work at

Emerson, he had taught in summer schools of various colleges, and had given lecture courses at Bates and Tufts Colleges and at the Universities of Georgia, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan. In 1930, Berea College conferred upon him the degree of Doctor of Letters.

All teachers in the field of speech will mourn the passing of a leader and teacher so accomplished, so vigorous and versatile, and so highly regarded for his character and personality.

EASTERN PUBLIC SPEAKING CONFERENCE

The twenty-eighth annual meeting of the Eastern Public Speaking Conference will be held at the Hotel Victoria, 51st Street and Seventh Avenue, New York City, on April 20, 21, and 22. Thursday, April 20, will be devoted especially to the work of high school teachers, with a general program beginning at 10 o'clock. All sectional programs are allowed from two and a half to three hours, so that there will be time for discussion. Among the guest speakers for the Conference will be Rev. John Haynes Holmes, Professor Charles Sears Baldwin, Miss Marjorie Gullan of England, Mr. James Wallington of the National Broadcasting Company, Dr. Smiley Blanton, and Dr. Alfred Adler.

A. B. Williamson of New York University, President of the Conference announces that the convention fee will this year be one dollar, instead of two dollars as in previous years.

CENTRAL STATES SPEECH ASSOCIATION

The first meeting of the Central States Speech Association was held at Iowa City, Iowa, on March 3 and 4, in conjunction with the annual Iowa University Conference of Teachers of Speech and a debate tournament under the auspices of Delta Sigma Rho. The registration at the meeting was about one hundred and seventy-five.

The Executive Committee of the Association voted to retain the state organizations as the basis of the Association's structure, i. e., the governing power of the Association will consist of representatives from state organizations. At present, organizations in the following states are co-operating: Iowa, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Wisconsin, Minnesota. The Executive Committee re-elected Alan Monroe of Purdue University as President and C. R. Layton of Muskingum College as Secretary. Committee reports showed work being done upon a survey of high school curricula, upon the obtaining of college speech work for all teachers' licenses.

Speakers at the general meetings were President Walter A. Jessup, Harry G. Barnes, and Lee F. Travis, of the University of Iowa, Gladys Borchers, University of Wisconsin, and Superintendent A. Dale Welsch of Elkader, Iowa. At the Conference Dinner on Friday evening, March 3, Dean Ralph Dennis of Northwestern University reported upon the National Convention at Los Angeles and Clarence T. Simon, also of Northwestern University, delivered the dinner address.

At sectional meetings on speech science and pathology, speakers were Lee F. Travis, E. M. MacEwen, Joseph Tiffin, Don Lewis, and Joseph P. Kelley, of the University of Iowa, Robert West, University of Wisconsin, S. N. Trevino, University of Chicago, Clarence T. Simon, Northwestern University, and Dr. Smiley Blanton, of New York City. At sectional meetings upon debate, public speaking, and radio speaking, speakers were Henry L. Ewbank of the University of Wisconsin, H. A. White, University of Nebraska, E. C. Buehler, University of Kansas, J. H. McBurney, University of Michigan, Elwood Murray, University of Denver, Clay Harshbarger, University of Iowa, J. P. Ryan, Grinnell College, and Hoyt H. Hudson, Princeton University. At evening round tables upon research, speakers were, in addition to some already mentioned, W. N. Brigance of Wabash College and H. C. Heffner of Northwestern University. Dr. Smiley Blanton of New York City and Hoyt H. Hudson of Princeton University were guests of the Association.